The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CIX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1919 No. 2834

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS..... 537

EDITORIALS:

The Resuscitation of Liberty..... 539

The Revolt of the Rank and File..... 540

The Russian Crisis..... 541

HOW NOT TO VALUE THE RAILROADS. By Samuel Spring..... 542

THE DEATH OF AUTUMN. By Edna St. Vincent Millay..... 544

LITERATURE:

More Walpole Letters..... 544

Indian Art and Archæology..... 545

Tales of Three Nations..... 546

BOOKS IN BRIEF..... 547

DRAMA: Comedy and Tragi-Comedy. By L. L..... 548

BOOKS OF THE WEEK..... 554

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION..... 549

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, NEW YORK. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

THE past week has seen the defeat of the Shantung amendment to the Peace Treaty and of the Fall amendments as well. This brought no surprise save in the vote. It was supposed that more than thirty-five Senators would cast their ballots against the iniquitous procedure by which Japan is made the recipient of rights in China some of which were never even conferred upon Germany. It would seem to have been a pretty clear-cut moral issue, but the sensitiveness of the Senate to moral issues is far from what it ought to be, although it is improving so far as the treaty is concerned. As for the Fall amendments, no one took them seriously. Of course, the defeat of the Shantung amendment has been taken by the daily press as proof that the Republican opposition is collapsing. In this case the wish is father to the thought. There is still one more amendment to be voted on—the Johnson amendment relating to the British votes in the League of Nations. After that is out of the way—and it now looks as if it might fail by only two or three votes—the struggle will come over the reservations. There is a growing determination on the part of Republicans to stiffen these reservations and even to increase their number. Meanwhile, time is passing and time fights on the side of the "irreconcilables" who desire the complete defeat of the treaty. The end of the battle is by no means in sight, despite jubilant assertions that the treaty will be ratified within two weeks.

LIKE a voice from the tombs comes a special Washington dispatch to *The Sun* (New York) telling of a conference held at the Department of Justice to consider "comprehensive plans for putting new vigor into the Government's campaign to reduce the high cost of living." We had thought all that done and forgotten at least a month ago. Why revive the memory of old promises? Have we not had the President's illness, the steel strike, the World's Series, and D'Annunzio to distract attention from the Government's valiant crusade? Surely it served its purpose in its day; why ask more? The dispatch informs us that the campaign "has not been much of a success in actual reduction of prices," and that a further course of action is under consideration, "one calculated to have a deeper effect upon the markets of the country and the general economic situation." With bated breath we await the announcement of the plan.

THE progress of the Industrial Conference during the week does not give much promise of a fortunate outcome. The fight has been primarily over the resolution for arbitration of the steel strike. This resolution, introduced by Mr. Gompers, offered a suspension of the strike pending arbitration by the conference, with the proviso that the Steel Corporation must take back the striking employees. This resolution made no headway from the moment of its introduction, being opposed by the capitalist section, with Dr. Eliot, for the public, insisting that the subject was not germane to the conference. Mr. Gompers's eloquent warning to the capitalists and the public representatives that if the steel strike was not arbitrated, the country would have to face the radicals, and perhaps hear from the I. W. W., failed to move the conference at all. That body has been unable to agree upon the fundamental matter of collective bargaining. At this writing the only question of importance, therefore, in connection with the conference is just when it will dissolve. Indeed, one would almost be tempted to add the hope that it will dissolve promptly, were it not for the discouragement that the collapse would bring to many who have really believed that it lay within the power of this singularly constituted body, with its group system of voting, to solve the menacing industrial problems before us. Behind the labor scenes, it is now obviously more than ever a fight on the part of the conservative labor leaders to hold their places.

THE ecclesiastical Council of Macon is popularly supposed to have rendered a negative decision on the question of "souls for women." We are assured that this story is a canard; however, the interesting point is not whether the incident actually happened or not, but that it easily could have happened. For centuries it has been assumed that men were qualified to settle all questions of vital concern to women, and the present generation is running fairly true to form. Women played an active part in the World War; they were certainly deeply interested in the settlement of its issues; yet no woman delegate sat in the Peace Conference. No woman delegate has been appointed to the projected International Labor Conference, although many questions affecting women and children will come before that body for consideration. Even in the radical labor

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement the old idea seems firmly intrenched. Jouhaux, the French labor leader, recently assured a delegation of women that his organization made no distinction between men and women, yet when asked to recommend a woman delegate to the Labor Conference his answer was, "Ah, that would be impossible." Fortunately, working women refuse to acquiesce in this anachronistic idea. They are determined to have a voice in their own affairs. The National Women's Trade Union League is to be congratulated on having directed attention to the injustice being done to women in industry, by calling the first International Congress of Working Women, to be held in Washington the week preceding the International Labor Conference.

THANKS to vigorous action taken by *Common Sense* under the able editorship of Francis W. Hirst, a deliberate attempt to impose protection upon England by bureaucratic fiat has been promptly ended. Sir Auckland Geddes calmly imposed a system of trading licenses for the right to import a large number of articles such as agricultural machinery, bacon, baskets, baths, barbed wire, bootlaces, boots, brooms, brushes, bulbs, and butter, to cite only a few. No one could import these goods, the complete list of which covered two pages of *Common Sense*, without permission from the Government. These licenses practically constituted monopolies and established monopoly prices for those favored manufacturers who received the licenses, with the result that exorbitant profits were made by the few at the expense of the many. An Association to Resist Embargoes and Monopolies was rapidly organized with the aid of such men as Lord Parmoor, Sir Herbert Leon, and Sir John Simon, and at once won a victory in that Sir Auckland abandoned the list and his special-license policy, although sticking to a general license—something quite meaningless in the eyes of the law. This, too, will have to be resisted. As Lord Parmoor put it, "the principle of *droit administratif* is making fatal progress and thus undermining the legal safeguards of our civil liberties which have been built up by centuries of effort." All over the world the most lawless people today seem to be the bureaucrats. In Washington as in London, they throw the laws overboard and do what they please, while inveighing against those who are credited with being so wicked as to wish to end the reign of law.

WHATEVER else the war did, it certainly accelerated the breakdown of the industrial order out of which it sprang. The economic imperialists who made it perhaps counted the outcome a victory if they lived in London or Paris or New York, a defeat if in Berlin or Vienna, a disaster if in Petrograd—but the more discerning even among them already perceive that the struggle sapped the foundations of industrial autocracy in victorious and vanquished states alike. In the field of transportation, for example, the Italian railwaymen (in view of the deficiencies of government management) months ago demanded for themselves a large measure of administration of the lines; the British workers are out for nationalization, and in our own country the Plumb plan represents a complete overturn of old ideas. Interestingly enough, a single week brings news of significant developments in both France and Germany. From the latter country comes a demand on the part of the railwaymen for joint responsibility and representation of the men in all questions affecting the personnel. The workers desire the formation of committees with a substantial measure of power at all places where there are as many as twenty employees. In France the termination of military control was marked by the institution of a "committee of exploitation" to control the roads. The committee will comprise in addition to officials and operating managers of the lines three representatives of commerce and industry designated by the Minister of Public Works and three representatives of the employees, also chosen by the Minister. The plan is intended to insure direct participation of workers and technical men in management and operation. The process of democratic control is making headway in the railroad industry everywhere; and it is not in transportation alone that the new spirit is at work. The task of the future is to make industrial self-government efficient.

OUR compliments to General Wood. He is doing a wonderful work in showing just where that kind of militarism leads which he typifies, and under which we Americans have been living. He is compelling every reactionary in the country to think well of him as a Presidential candidate. He is bringing forward hourly the spectacle of a "white terror" such as they had in Munich and Finland and in certain Kolchakian portions of Russia. We are certain that nothing would please the General more than to stand some people against a wall and shoot them. He is patterning in this after Elihu Root, who, on his return from Russia, wanted to shoot some editors at sunrise; but for the present General Wood wants only to smash Reds and radicals and to export all people, citizens or aliens, who dare to say they dislike this country's form of government, or the men who manage it. If times must get worse before they get better, if Americans must be further Prussianized before they are rebaptized in Americanism and republican ways of thought, General Wood is doing a most useful service, and so are all who are making of the army a strike-breaking force.

UNTIL the full facts are known, it is advisable to accept with caution newspaper accounts of the closing of the Scandinavian-American Bank of Fargo, and editorial comments thereon. The bank was declared insolvent on October 2 by the State Banking Board, two of whose members, Attorney-General William Langer and Secretary of State Thomas Hall, in this action overruled Governor Frazier, the third member. The bank, which has had close relations with the Nonpartisan League, is declared by Assistant Attorney-General Sheets to be "a vast, unwieldy, financial monstrosity unable to take care of its obligations." Governor Frazier in reply terms the attack on the bank a violation of "the rules of justice," a "move against the laws of the State," and an "effort to wreck and destroy all farmers' organizations." The bank has applied for a writ of certiorari to require the Banking Board to certify to the court the record on which it has acted, and it is to be hoped that the whole affair will be promptly ventilated; for both the business and the political interests involved are so important that it is essential to get at once to the bottom of the charges and counter-charges. At the instance of the Attorney General an examination of the Bank of North Dakota has also been undertaken by State Auditor Kositzky, an opponent of the Nonpartisan leaders. It will be recalled that this bank is really central to the whole scheme of State business activity initiated by Governor Frazier and his associates.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Resuscitation of Liberty

TO many it seems ridiculous, and to some thankless, that a conference has been called in New York to work for the restoration of civil liberty in America. The former include many high-minded and sincere Americans, still under the anæsthesia of the war spirit, who do not realize that civil liberty needs to be restored, but who at any moment are likely to open their eyes and know things as they are. The latter comprise some of the finest and most discerning spirits in the country, who have stood in vain against the growth of bigotry and autocracy until, discouraged, they have fallen back at last on "Oh, what's the use?"

Such discouragement is not without justification. The armistice that ended the war to make the world freer and more democratic was signed almost a year ago, and the peace treaty has at last become a reality in Europe. Coincident with this, France has lifted the state of siege, is returning the government from the military to the civil authorities, and has abolished the censorship. In America, on the other hand, the Secretary of War has recently authorized department commanders without awaiting orders from Washington to use Federal troops against civilians on the request of the Governor of any State (apparently thus shifting responsibility from the Administration to individual officers), and General Wood has declared martial law in Gary; the House of Representatives has voted that the war-time immigration restrictions be continued for a year; the constitutional guarantee of public assembly is denied in several steel towns; Federal prisons are filled with political prisoners; and the espionage laws are still in effect, the effort to muzzle the press continuing through such means as the Lusk Committee in New York State, whose inquiry into Bolshevism has finally taken the form of intimidating and prosecuting the most helpless and most obscure of the radical periodicals.

Yes, there is some reason for discouragement on the part of those who see clearly the prostration of civil liberty in America. The easy assumption of so many that we could check our freedom like our hat for the period of the war, and get it back for the asking afterward from the coat-room boy, now stands disproved. But there is another reason, we believe, why it is not so easy to regrasp our surrendered liberty. The truth is that we did not give up as much as we thought in 1917. Little by little we had been relinquishing our freedom for the past quarter of a century. As a contributor to a recent issue of *The Nation* remarked (Individual Liberty in America, Alice Edgerton, October 11), our readiness to part with certain civil rights when this country entered the World War was of itself proof of how thin that freedom had become. In other words, little more than the shell was left in 1917, and to get that back will not suffice. What is needed is nothing less than a regeneration in public opinion—a renaissance of the ideas upon which America was founded. Understanding of this is essential for those who would help in the work. Otherwise they will expect results too soon and be discouraged when they are not forthcoming.

Without attempting to trace historically the gradual loss of liberty in America in the last quarter of a century, it is enough to say that it went hand in hand—was a part of—our much vaunted industrial development. By 1917 we had achieved as high a degree of Prussianization in our industrial life as Germany had in her political life. We had the lock step in our factories and offices; Germany had the goose step in her army and public service. In both cases the individual—his life and liberty—was subordinated to the machine. In the intellectual world, we were approaching a similar condition. Our colleges had become largely sterile, our press mainly commercial. Slogans had displaced analysis and ready-made thought was turned out according to the rules of quantity production. In our political life, however, right down to 1917, we had preserved a substantial measure of liberty. Then, as in Europe, such a system proved incapable of making war. Big Business was called in and its methods were installed, from the War Trade Board to the American Red Cross. Political liberty went to the scrap heap.

Such are the conditions. What are the remedies? In the first place, let us recognize that it is public opinion which must be moved. It is idle to pillory individuals. Attorney-General Gregory was an incident and Postmaster-General Burleson is a tool of national intolerance. There has hardly been an arbitrary or illegal executive or judicial act since 1917 that has not been acclaimed by the vast body of public opinion—or shall we say public hysteria? America's very tradition of freedom has worked against her in this respect. Thousands of honest men and women have been so imbued with the idea that this is a free country that they find it hard to believe otherwise, despite ever-accumulating evidence to the contrary. But is a change in sentiment not at hand? The Peace of Versailles has shattered many an illusion, and Americans, like Europeans, are beginning to analyze and reexamine fundamental conceptions which heretofore have been breathed in as thoughtlessly as the air. Several hopeful signs have lately appeared. Thus, a conservative newspaper like *The Baltimore Sun* in its issue of October 14 remarks: "Any man, woman, or child who believes that Bolshevism, socialism, or syndicalism is a good thing has a right to say so, provided they do not advocate violence or disobedience to the laws of the country in connection with their propaganda. . . . Unless we have absolute freedom of speech in regard to all public questions, many reforms as desirable as Bolshevism is undesirable would be rendered impossible and progress would be a dream."

"Republics exist only on the tenure of being constantly agitated," said Wendell Phillips, and this is the moment for friends of liberty to renew their appeals to the American mind and conscience—to a public opinion stunned by the repercussion of the awful and revolutionary events of the last five years, and more pathetically eager than one may guess to get a new hold on truth. The New York conference is therefore being held at an opportune time; and it is specially fitting that its membership should include not only representative American liberals, but the delegation from the British Civil Liberties Council now in this country, including such men as Pethick Lawrence, B. N. Langdon-Davies, secretary of the council, and W. N. Ewer, foreign editor of *The Daily Herald* (London). The Anglo-American tradition of liberty is one of the most precious of our common possessions, and it is by no means dead. Let those not give up, therefore, who are using the pulmotor over the prostrate body politic—overcome by the fumes of a ruthless industrialism and asphyxiated by the poison gas of war. The heart still beats and the life is worth saving. The breath of liberty will yet return.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Revolt of the Rank and File

THE most extraordinary phenomenon of the present time, the most incalculable in its after effects, the most menacing in its threat of immediate consequences, and the most alluring in its possibilities of ultimate good, is the unprecedented revolt of the rank and file. It is a world-wide movement much accelerated by the war. In Russia it has dethroned the Czar and for two years maintained Lenin in his stead. In Korea and India and Egypt and Ireland it keeps up an unyielding resistance to political tyranny. In England it brought about the railway strike, against the judgment of the men's own executives. In Seattle and San Francisco it has resulted in the stevedores' recent refusal to handle arms or supplies destined for the overthrow of the Soviet Government. In one district of Illinois it manifested itself in a resolution of striking miners, unanimously requesting their State executive "to go to hell." In Pittsburgh, according to Mr. Gompers, it compelled the reluctant American Federation officers to call the steel strike, lest the control pass into the hands of the I. W. W.'s and other "radicals." In New York it brought about the longshoremen's strike and kept the men out in defiance of union officials, and caused the upheaval in the printing trade, which the international officers, even though the employers worked hand in glove with them, were completely unable to control.

The common man, forgetting the old sanctions, and losing faith in the old leadership, has experienced a new access of self-confidence, or at least a new recklessness, a readiness to take chances on his own account. In consequence, as is by this time clear to discerning men, authority cannot longer be imposed from above; it comes automatically from below. This is the revolution. We stand in its presence, understanding not whence it cometh or whither it goeth. Not understanding, we go out against it with a sword, and with a spear—but its weapons are of the spirit.

Whence comes it? Not out of the trifling circumstances in which we trace its origin; not out of the work of "foreign agitators"; not out of the activities of the "Reds." They have been preaching and teaching and writing from the days of Plato; they will keep on till the trump of doom. If the people listen to their voice today, it is only because it gives utterance to what is already in men's souls; otherwise the "agitators" are naught. We may exclude or deport or jail or kill our alien guests—yet is the revolution not stayed; for it is in the minds and hearts of our own.

This change of heart, we repeat, is not the fruit of propaganda. So far as it is the creation of any human agency, it is the product of our own bankrupt leadership. The arch-politicians at Paris who have wrecked the peace and made mock of all the fair words with which they beguiled the people in their bloody sweat—for the general cynicism and loss of faith they are responsible. And the lesser politicians at Washington and London and Paris and Berlin, at every minor capital and governmental centre in the world, who have shown the hollowness of the pretence and the futility of the promise by virtue of which they held office—they are responsible. And the industrial princes who held in their hand the power of life and death over thousands of their fellows, yet thought only of their own wealth and selfish power—they are responsible. And the labor leaders whose task it was to bring their followers out of the Egyptian darkness of ignorance and injustice, yet sat contentedly among the fleshpots or stretched out their hands for the crumbs that fell from the master's table—they are responsible. And the "leaders of thought," the priests and professors, the lawyers and journalists, to whom was given the lofty privilege to proclaim truth, but who yet bowed themselves in the temple of Rimmon—they are responsible.

Plainly the path is beset with dangers and pitfalls; and if the crisis is not met with wisdom and honesty and fearlessness, the course over which we travel may yet be strewn with destruction and made slippery with blood. For these masses of men who now for the first time are taking into their own hands the shaping of their own destiny and therewith the fate of the world—they are not wiser or better than those who in the past have been their masters; no idealization of "the people" should lead us to forget that the rank and file have been brought up in much the same school of ideas as the old leaders; namely, that they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can. It is by no means impossible, then, that the apparent shift of power indicated by the new movement may bring in the beginning fresh acts of spoliation, a wild riot of red ruin, as many thoughtful observers fear. Such is particularly likely to be the case in the first instance, indeed, if this movement is to be met with nothing but sheer unthinking opposition, with forcible suppression by means of the policeman's club and the soldier's machine gun, if Gary and Huntington and the muzzled steel-towns of the Monongahela Valley are to be the sole reply to this manifestation of the workers' purpose to rule their own lives. Unhappily, our capitalists and politicians seem able to conceive the problem in no other terms. They appear to feel that we are shut up to a choice between ruthless suppression (by the use of armed force, if necessary) of this mutiny of the rank and file, and submission to a "dictatorship of the proletariat," in the worst sense of that horrendous term. Not dissimilarly did the rulers of the eighteenth century think of the problem of political democracy when the revolution thrust it upon them; we see today that they misconceived the method and meaning of the whole process.

This new mass movement of workers cries aloud, not for opposition, but for coöperation; for it cannot be suppressed. It needs understanding, sympathetic guidance, education, rationalization, spiritualization. It needs prophets and teachers, men who shall be at once brave and honest and thoughtful and humble, men who shall have faith and vision and patience. Leaders it will in time find or create; but they must be leaders in a new sense. Theirs it will be not to rule or exercise authority on the one hand, or to assure their own power by flattering the mob on the other, but to discover and proclaim the truth of industrial and social relations, no matter whether it be at the moment popular or not. The future has no place for the soldier; the lawgiver and judge must hold their places by speaking with the voice of reason, not of force. It is time, then, for the powerful and possessing classes, before it is too late, to give up their preoccupation with authority and property, to recognize in this new movement, not the emergence of merely hostile and destructive forces, but the next step in the long march of the human race toward liberty. Let them not fight that movement, but work with it and in it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Russian Crisis

THE dramatic attack upon Riga is but an incident in the new Russian crisis. The important question of this crisis is: Will winter come before Denikin-Kolchak-Judenitch can "solve" the Russian problem? Europe cannot endure another winter of blockade and warfare in Russia. The Russian reaction has this one last chance, and it is therefore straining every nerve to achieve military victory against the Soviet Government. It is a race against time. With the capture of Orel, Denikin's centre is on the way to Moscow. His centre is plunging forward in utter disregard of the peasant uprisings in his rear and of the attacks upon his left by Petlura's Ukrainian Nationalist forces. He has given up hope of effecting a juncture with the Poles through the swamps of Polesia; and in desperation he has ordered Judenitch to advance upon Petrograd despite the lack of morale among the mercenaries of ten nationalities constituting the troops of the "Russian Northwest Government." Finally, the German-Balt soldiers of the new "West Russian Government" are taking their part in Kolchak-Denikin's latest attack upon the Soviet Government, by attacking the Nationalist Baltic Governments which are attempting to negotiate peace with the Soviets.

The situation in the Baltic is difficult to understand because there is confusion among the Governments of the Entente as to their Russian policy. This is true particularly of Great Britain. Lloyd George wants to be through with the whole "Russian adventure." British public opinion is pressing hard for a non-intervention policy. But the responsible Minister for Russian affairs is Winston Churchill, who is wedded to thoroughgoing intervention in support of the Kolchak-Denikin All-Russian imperialism; and General Gough, who is the head of the British-Allied Mission in the Baltic, is of the Churchill school. When Lloyd George permitted himself the recent *ballon d'essai* at Paris with the press statement that the Russian question had been discussed and settled at a meeting of the Supreme Council, he gave notice to Churchill and Denikin that it was time for Denikin to succeed or British intervention would have to cease. Success is, after all, the highest morality in international politics.

The British policy in the Baltic—which, much to French chagrin, has been the Allied policy there—has played fast and loose with two irreconcilable ideas. The one is the support of Kolchak and the all-Russian aspiration to restore the boundaries of the old Russian Empire. The other is the support of the Nationalist Governments of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland, which demand recognition of their political independence and which prefer to treat with Bolshevism rather than to fall again under the all-Russian imperialist domination. The conflict between these two ideas has been violent since last June, when the Peace Conference gave semi-recognition to Kolchak and expressed satisfaction with his reply to the Allies' seven conditions. In his reply he refused to recognize the independence of the Baltic lands. Since that time the Baltic states have regarded the Peace Conference with suspicion, and it is no wonder that, when the Soviet army recaptured Pskov at the end of August and began to overrun Esthonia, the Esthonian Government offered to negotiate with the Soviet Government concerning the "adjustment of their mutual relations." These negotiations are still in progress.

Why should Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania expect any consideration from the Peace Conference? The November armistice left them under the control of the German occupying armies for fear the Bolsheviki might swarm over them. Those same German armies under the very same von der Goltz had taken Riga once before from the Bolsheviki on May 28, 1919, with the approval of the Peace Conference, and thousands of Lettish men, women, and children suspected of Bolshevism were executed. The Baltic blockade of the Peace Conference was maintained against bankrupt Esthonia as late as April, 1919—the same Esthonia that was commended in public statements by France in May, 1918, and by Great Britain in September, 1918, as having shown loyalty to the Allied cause despite the German military government and despite the Bolshevik invasions. Over and over again, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have begged the Peace Conference for recognition of their independence. The Kolchak all-Russian theory of the Peace Conference has prevented this. As a measure of last resort, the Premiers and Foreign Ministers not only of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, but of Finland as well, have been holding conferences since September 14 at Reval, looking to the creation of a Baltic Federation. The presence of Finnish delegates is significant. Finland's political independence has secured some recognition. Yet Denikin has protested against it. It is even reported that a Polish delegate has attended some of the meetings.

One of the points upon which agreement has been reached is that Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania will make peace with the Soviet Government together, if they make peace at all. But they are being driven to this, not only because of the doctrinaire all-Russianism of the Peace Conference, but also by the great hold which Bolshevist ideas have upon the native population, both in the industrial towns and in the country. The Esthonian Socialists have joined the Moscow International; and at a recent Congress of Socialists of the Baltic States (Finland included), the labor parties of Europe were called upon to keep their governments from hindering the peace negotiations with Soviet Russia. Moreover, the peasantry, particularly among the Letts, is determined to secure confiscation and distribution of farming lands now in the hands chiefly of the Baltic barons. If the nationalist Governments will not carry through a radical agrarian policy speedily, the peasantry will invite Moscow in to do it for them.

But while the Baltic states are conferring, Judenitch's White Army, if the press dispatches can be believed, is about to fall upon Petrograd. The official organ of the "Northwest Russian Government" (which is not to be confused with the Archangel Government and which is a "government" only in the sense that it will begin to function as a government when Petrograd is taken) declares that England has equipped Judenitch for his advance and has an understanding whereby "British interests in the Baltic" (and as some reports say, in Persia as well) are to be safeguarded. At any rate the Peace Conference was informed officially in August by General Gough of the Judenitch plans for taking Petrograd.

It is as Judenitch's rear-guard that the German soldiers and Baltic Landwehr of the new "West Russian Government" have attacked Riga. It is estimated that about 20,000

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of von der Goltz's "Iron Division" have gone over into the all-Russian army under the Russian Prince Lieven and Colonel Avaloff-Bermondt. It is really immaterial whether or not this army is acting in official collusion with Judenitch. The purpose of the army is the same as that of Judenitch, namely, to further the all-Russian reaction by combating the nationalist Baltic Governments on the one hand and Bolshevism on the other. Von der Goltz, who has obeyed the orders of the German Government and who officially has no further connection with the Baltic army, is as sincere an anti-Bolshevist as Judenitch or Denikin. In a recent interview he declared that "the British attempt to create an anti-Bolshevist front has broken down," meaning, the attempt of some of the British officials in the Baltic to use Esthonian, Lettish, Lithuanian, and Finnish troops against the Bolsheviki. The Judenitch-Denikin-von der Goltz way is therefore the only one left. But the former German troops are not anti-Bolshevist crusaders for nothing. As von der Goltz adds in his interview: "My troops consider that when they have defeated Bolshevism they have earned the right to settle down as peasants, workers, and otherwise in Vitelsk, Smolensk, and other parts of Russia." They were promised citizenship, and perhaps land as well, by the Lettish Government of Ulmanis during one of the many times when that Government found itself forsaken by the Peace Conference, and ground between the upper and the nether millstones of the German-Balts and the Bolsheviki. Nor is it to be forgotten that if this German-Balt-All-Russian coup is successful, the conservative Baltic barons are confirmed in their political and economic mastery over the Baltic provinces.

All of this cannot be entirely displeasing to the militarists of the Peace Conference, particularly the French. The Baltic barons can be trusted to forge a link in the anti-Bolshevist *cordon sanitaire* much better than the present radical democratic governments of the Baltic peoples. More than this, probably now Marshal Foch has his pretext for sending Polish "relief" troops into Lithuania, to which Polish imperialism has an "historic" claim. An imperialist Poland is, in the Foch theory, the safest equivalent of an Imperial Russia on Germany's eastern border.

What will be the rôle of Great Britain in all of this? The Baltic states have pledged themselves not to make peace with the Soviets without the consent of Great Britain. Under the influence of the Labor party and other liberal forces, Lloyd George is ready to ditch Churchill and Gough, and adopt a humane non-interventionist policy if—if Denikin and Judenitch are not victorious before winter. Meanwhile the all-Russian forces have the whole reactionary world behind them in their final effort. The Peace Conference through General Foch is inviting Germany and the neutrals to engage upon a "pacific blockade" of Soviet Russia. Evidently not enough Russians have been starved by the "cordon of death" and too many Germans and neutrals are getting passports into Russia. Among the reactionary helpers of the Peace Conference are now many of the former troops of von der Goltz, the bloody "Liberator" of Mannerheim's Finland from the Red Guards. The Peace Conference has the good wishes of every White Terrorist.

An American commissioner has just left New York for the Baltic. What are his instructions? Is he also to await the outcome of the Denikin-Judenitch drives, or is he free to judge the Baltic situation on its merits and from the point of view of the self-determination of peoples?

How Not to Value the Railroads

By SAMUEL SPRING

WHEN Mr. Plumb states (*The Nation*, July 19, 1919) that "it remained for the railway Brotherhoods to urge the legal interpretation of valuation" and first to advance "elementary truths which alone could bring harmony out of judicial disagreement," he must expect that his efforts will be viewed with awe, and possibly with smiles. For, although the day of miracles may not be gone, one least expects to find such revelations in the legal world. And, unhappily, when the Brotherhood theory is examined coldly, it does not appear even novel, but simply resolves itself into a deft though hasty jumble of legal half-truths, based, if one may speak with kindly candor, upon a repudiation or confusion of about everything that is firmly established in the field of constitutional valuation of railroads.

The Brotherhood theory or theories, though elusive, can perhaps be fairly summarized as follows: Railroads are public highways in which there are merely certain private rights of ownership; these private rights are limited and defined by corporate charters, and legal and constitutional provisions defining such charters; therefore, watered stock issued in violation of these charters should be excluded from any valuation. The argument so far is lucid, and is incorporated in the Brotherhoods' bill; but other conclusions are tacked on, foreign to the first premises. Railroad property, Mr. Plumb continues, can be valued only in view of its use as railroad property; private property has both a value in use and a value in exchange, but railroad property, which cannot be used for any purpose other than transportation, has no value in exchange, and for the railroads to seek such a value is unjust. Mr. Plumb then adds a third argument, contending that profits of the railroads—derived largely from excessive rates—invested in new property, and not paid out in dividends, should be excluded in any valuation. These three theories, or this tripartite theory, leads the Brotherhoods to the conclusion that the capital investment account of the railroads, amounting (as Mr. Plumb alleges), to nineteen billion dollars, is too high by at least one-third.

Perhaps the easiest way to approach this three-headed theory is first to point out that its conclusion is futile. Nothing is more firmly established in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and of the Interstate Commerce Commission, than the obviously just doctrine that the value of the railroads is in no way determined by the capital investment or property accounts of the railroads as carried on their books. Such, in fact, is the entire meaning and significance of the doctrine of physical appraisal of the railroads. Fair value as defined in the law under this doctrine in no way means book accounts, but simply the fair value of the property actually used in the public's service. Any other result would be patently unjust. Judge Lovett, for example, is staunchly opposed to the method of book values, for it would permit fraud. To be sure, the Warfield plan suggests book values as a method of valuation, and therefore the Warfield plan has been harshly criticized and justly criticized; but even Mr. Plumb could not reject such a theory more coldly and completely than the courts and commissions have done. To be sure, the Interstate Commerce Commission has given some consideration to property accounts in fixing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA, OHIO

rates, whenever it could not avoid so doing because of the uncompleted state of the physical appraisal of our railroads, begun March 1, 1913, but there is not a scintilla of judicial recognition of property accounts as constituting final fair value. Does it in any way lead to clearness or just discussion for the Brotherhoods to erect a grotesque straw man and to storm against it with bitter cries?

Considering Mr. Plumb's first line of argument, nothing is more firmly established under our Constitution than the rule that railroads are not public property with private rights, but privately-owned property in which the public has only a right—aside from the war power—to adequate, fair service at fair rates. The language of the Supreme Court quoted by Mr. Plumb is simply a recognition of this public right; indeed our railroads at first were intended literally as highways open to use by private vehicles, as are our streets. The rights of the public in our common carriers are among the most ancient of common-law rights. The earliest example—indeed the basis of our law of public utilities—was the mediæval inn. The public has a right to receive reasonable service at reasonable rates at a public inn; but who would contend that the public therefore owned the inn? Nothing is clearer than the fact that Mr. Plumb has simply turned the rule of law inside out. The Supreme Court of the United States, for example, said in the Minnesota rate cases (230 U. S. 352,454) of the railroads of the country: "The property is held in private ownership, and it is that property and not the original cost of it of which the owner may not be deprived without due process of law." Again in Northern Pacific Railroad vs. North Dakota (236 U. S. 585,595) the court said: "The railroad property is private property devoted to a public use. . . . Broad as is the power of regulation, the State does not enjoy the freedom of an owner. The fact that the property is devoted to a public use on certain terms does not justify the requirement that it shall be devoted to other public purposes." No doctrine is more firmly established under our Constitution.

The Brotherhoods' conclusion, based thus on a false premise, as to watered stock issued in violation of corporate law, is equally wide of the mark. Watered stock has nothing to do with valuation; that rule is fully established today. The public's attorneys, who, according to Mr. Plumb, "ignored . . . the elementary truths," years ago were able at least to urge that necessary conclusion. The Supreme Court unhesitatingly followed them. Indeed, physical valuation, as has already been stated, means simply this: disregard all questions of stock and capitalization, and value the property actually used by the carrier in the public service. Thus at one stroke all questions of stock or bonds are cut away. To be sure, the market—but not the par—value of the stocks and bonds of a carrier is one of the factors used in judging the value of the property itself. But that is entirely different from par value or capitalization. If Wall Street, judged from sales on the market, considers the outstanding shares of New Haven worth one million dollars in the aggregate, that is perhaps an indication of the value of the equity in the property. But that is as different as the day is from the night from the par value, which may be a billion. And even the market value of a railroad's securities is being ignored today by the courts and commissions, because of the manipulation of stocks in Wall Street.

Again, Mr. Plumb's discussion about value in use and value in exchange of our railroads—an elementary rule of economics—is merely the statement of a truth the law long since has recognized. Railroads have no value in exchange, not so much because they are subject to a public use, as because they are almost never exchanged or sold. Railroad properties are almost unique; they are too vast to be bought and sold like houses. (See my article in Vol. XXXII., *Harvard Law Review*, p. 489). Since they are almost never sold on the market—as distinct from their shares—they have no value in exchange. The courts, years ago, established this fact for which the Brotherhoods contend today. The courts strive to value a railroad by ascertaining what it has cost or what it would cost to build it. Are the Brotherhoods so hard pressed for arguments that they must argue for rules of justice which everyone admits?

In the case of the valuation of lands, this argument about value in exchange was persistently urged by the public's attorneys in the Minnesota rate cases. The argument was there cogently advanced that since railroad lands could not be freed from their railroad use, they had no exchange or market value, and original cost—excluding unearned increment—must be taken as the final value. This argument the court denied, and fixed market value as the final value. Thus the question is probably closed. Mr. Plumb asserts: "Even the public's attorneys, in arguing the public's interests, have ignored . . . the elementary truths. . . . The courts have not been able to reaffirm these primary truths, because they were not advanced in the hearings, and did not become part of the record." It will strike many liberals unpleasantly to have Mr. Plumb accuse those leaders in valuation who fought so valiantly and sturdily for the public's cause for the last two decades—men like Senator Lenroot and Senator Cummins and Congressman Esch—of blindness and failure to urge elementary truths, when all Mr. Plumb can do is to repeat, in twisted, obscure form, the very arguments they patiently evolved and courageously advanced.

So far as the use of profits for property investment and not dividends is concerned, this too is a familiar argument. It would seem clear that if a carrier chooses to use its earnings to improve its properties and not to pay dividends, the property so bought should be included in the final valuation. Indeed no one objects to such a rule until the question of unreasonably high rates is raised. Shall the carrier keep the property bought out of such unjust rates? It seems clear that the past must be closed. If rates, as fixed by the public in the past, have been too low, the carrier has no relief. It seems impossible to go back and right what has been finished. For example, until the Knoxville decision, the public regulatory bodies allowed a carrier no annual allowance for unmatured depreciation. The Supreme Court held in that case (212 U. S. 1) that such a depreciation allowance must be allowed in the future, but that the carrier would have to stand the losses of the past. The decisions are clear that the past cannot be opened so far as property investments are concerned; the sole question in valuation is the fair and just value of the carrier's property today.

Valuation is a difficult, harrowing problem. The solution is by no means determined today. The Brotherhoods are entirely correct when they insist upon the right to have their views considered fairly and patiently. Yet if they herald themselves as celestial prophets, they must proclaim the law and not merely ramble and groan. If they would wield the sword of justice, they must be dextrous enough to grasp it by the handle instead of by the blade.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Death of Autumn

By EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY

When reeds are dead and a straw to thatch the marshes,
And feathered pampas-grass rides into the wind
Like agéd warriors westward, tragic, thinned
Of half their tribe, and over the flattened rushes,
Stripped of its secret, open, stark, and bleak,
Blackens afar the half-forgotten creek,
Then leans on me the weight of the year and crushes
My heart. I know that Beauty must ail and die
And will be born again,—but ah, to see
Beauty stiffened, staring up at the sky!
Oh, Autumn! Autumn!—What is the Spring to me?

Literature

More Walpole Letters

Supplement to the Letters of Horace Walpole. Edited by Paget Toynbee. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 2 vols.

IN the two admirable volumes which Mr. Paget Toynbee now publishes as a supplement to Mrs. Toynbee's sixteen volumes of the Correspondence of Horace Walpole we find 259 letters. Of these, according to the editor's statement in the preface, 111 are now printed for the first time, 23 are now first printed in full, and 125 are reprinted from sources some of which have only recently become available. In addition to the letters themselves, which are very carefully annotated, the present volumes contain 121 pages of additions and corrections to Mrs. Toynbee's volumes, a list of missing letters, and well-made indexes of Persons, Places, and Subjects.

In the letters themselves we are cheerfully carried back to the century in which gentlemen made the Grand Tour and sent one another such leisurely presents as chocolate cups, fans, tea, gold scissors, bantams, gold-fish, honeywater, and snuff-boxes. Elaborate and formal as the style of Walpole's letters usually is, his manner here varies greatly according to the persons whom he was addressing. The most pleasant and unaffected are those to Sir Horace Mann, Henry Fox (Lord Holland), and Thomas Gray. The letters to Conyers Middleton, whom Walpole reminds that imitation is the most natural proof of admiration, are stilted, complimentary, involved, and altogether highly reminiscent of the reverend gentleman who received them. Between these two extremes are letters of fine diversity—some of them even concise. To Thomas Brand, Walpole wrote upon the death of George II:

> Dear Brand,
> You love laughing; there is a King dead; can you help coming to town?

The letters from Italy, whither Walpole went at twenty-three, form the most nearly continuous narrative in the whole collection. At first the letters show that he found life in Rome very gay in the company of the Prince and Princess de Craon. He became acquainted with everybody, went to entertainments of all sorts, investigated ruins, and bought medals. But after the departure of the princely pair the balls (Walpole took to going masked in order that he need not dance), conversations, and teas bored rather than pleased him. So dull did he find his days that with Lord Lincoln and Joseph Spence he went in a chaise to Genoa, and "we employed ourselves the whole day in counting the number of loaded mules, etc., that we met on the road. They amounted to eight hundred and forty-seven. I once counted only on the Bouquet four hundred and fifty, but that was earlier in the morning." A certain excitement was added during the latter part of his stay by the necessity of reporting every day to Sir Horace Mann, British envoy-extraordinary to the court of Tuscany, the movements of the Pretender and the Boy and the current speculations about the next Pope. Mann is variously addressed as Dear Child, Dear Sir, or Sir Miny, and acquaintances are often referred to in the correspondence by code number. Thus early Walpole's peculiar qualities of epistolary malice had already been developed, and it found a congenial victim in Lady Mary. "Who do you imagine we found here? Lady Mary Wortley, of three months' standing, full of abuse on Turin, where, I suppose, she was found out as well as at Florence, Rome, Naples, Venice, &c., &c., &c. She was here three weeks without receiving a visit, when to get company she took it into her head to offer her mediation in this affair of the Genoese and the English captain. Rather, their defence, for she says she will have the captain broke; and accordingly has wrote her pleasure to Lord Hervey. Don't you like her taking Genoa under her protection? I don't know whether is greater her impudence in pretending an interest or the stupidity of the Genoese in believing she has it. I have been told that at Florence she tried to persuade Buondelmonti to write an English satire on the English then there, and offered to assist him, proposing at the same time to father it on Lord Pomfret. She was at that time in his house, not to mention what a soul for the supposed author of a satire. She has sent to desire to see us, and we shall go."

The letters from Italy were all written in 1740-1741; the others in the Supplement, dated for the most part at Arlington Street or Strawberry Hill, are more scattered in time and simply add interesting strokes to the picture already drawn in the earlier collections. The letters written from Arlington Street to keep Lord Holland posted on the plans and counterplans of political intrigue show Walpole invariably shrewd and caustic. "The two Grenvilles," he wrote for example, "proposed on the first day to issue two hundred pounds from the Treasury to support the poor, or hire a mob for themselves." And of Rousseau, whom Walpole had helped entertain during his visit to England, he later wrote in disgust when he heard that Rousseau had complained to Hume of the treatment accorded him: "I have almost a mind to send him one of Tom Hervey's letters, to show him why England is indifferent to new mad men, possessing so much superior of her own."

Walpole's letters to the Marquise du Deffand now for the first time take their place with his letters instead of with hers, and furnish nearly the only literary arguments in the present Supplement. He roused her ire by his failure to appreciate Montaigne, who bored Walpole even more than Bath where he had been ordered for the gout; and by his indifference to Voltaire's opinion of "The Castle of Otranto," a work for which Walpole felt a particular preference. "Je vous avoue, ma petite, . . . que de tous mes ouvrages, c'est l'unique où je me sois plu." In three long letters to Robert Jephson for whose "Braganza" Walpole had written the Epilogue he sets forth his notion of tragedy, stating very firmly, however, that it is comedy he holds to be the "chef-oeuvre of human genius." Walpole never ceased to want to be amused. When in France he would associate with none but lively people, would see none but amusing sights or plays, and would read only for entertainment. Even at home, he asked of every book that it be amusing, or at least that it be not instructive—finding, as he said, all the instruction he needed in the House of Commons.

The Supplement has but one direct reference to "the American War," though he writes to the Countess of Ailesbury that Ireland has "forty thousand men in arms, which may keep the peace, for what forty thousand *ask*, it is not civil to refuse, tho' we were so ill-bred as to affront three millions." When an old man he wrote to Charles Bedford: "We have great alacrity at blundering into wars, besides little ingenuity in making peaces, which alone ought to be a reason against making war." He advised Jephson in his search for a plot to "hazard a *future* American story—suppose empires to be founded there—give them new customs, new manners."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Throughout the entire Supplement Walpole reveals himself as more consistently an antiquarian and collector than anything else. From the time of his first visit to Italy as a young man his antiquarian passion exhibited itself, and it was there that he laid the foundations of his famous collection at Strawberry Hill. In London he attended auctions and sales regularly, and when he became too feeble sent his man. Friends all over the world remembered his love of the old and the beautiful. Fibulas, ancient lamps, sacrificing instruments, medals, talismans, urns, pictures, prints, manuscripts—all things strange or rare were brought or sent to him, the giver apparently well satisfied by the intelligent and enthusiastic pleasure each gift aroused. At least on one occasion, however, the antique failed to appeal to him and when upon Kitty Clive's death he took over her belongings he gave to Miss Jane Pope "the great basket of shell-flowers, which poor Mrs. Clive admired, but I own I do not."

Indian Art and Archaeology

The Beginnings of Buddhist Art. By A. Foucher; translated by L. A. Thomas and F. W. Thomas. Paris: Paul Geuthner; London: Humphrey Milford.

Indian Painting. By Percy Brown. Calcutta: The Association Press; London and New York: Oxford University Press.

THE problems of Indian archæology are made peculiarly difficult by the paucity of early historical records and by the scantiness and restricted character of the sculptures and paintings that have survived the vicissitudes of an exceptionally destructive climate and of a devastating iconoclasm during the rule of the Muhammadan invaders especially in the time of the bigoted Emperor Aurangzib. Of works by the artists of "The old Native School of Central India," as M. Foucher designates it, very few have come down to us; the architectural remains at Sanchī, Barhut, and Bodh Gaya, belonging to the second or the first century A.D., a few stray remains of other sculptures, and the paintings in the rock-cut temples at Ajanta, the earliest of which are ascribed to the first century A.D., comprise nearly the entire list. More of the Græco-Buddhist sculptures from Gandhāra—the ancient Sanscrit name of the Panjāb—have been preserved, and a considerable mass of Buddhist texts is available, but these have been so frequently rewritten to accommodate them to the doctrines of different sects and contain so many interpolations and changes that the students find them confusing as often as elucidative. Moreover, as M. Foucher remarks, "We are never quite certain that the logical sequence of ideas is exactly parallel to the historical succession of the facts."

In the first essay, which gives its title to the book, M. Foucher takes up the enigma of a Buddhist art which represents the life of Buddha without figuring the Buddha. To solve the riddle he resorts to the ingenious and highly probable hypothesis that the early pilgrims to the four holy places, which the Buddha taught that "an honorable worshipper should visit with religious emotion," were accustomed to bring back from each some small material souvenir of what they had seen; and, as by constant association of ideas and images these souvenirs sufficed to evoke the miracles of which they became the recognized symbols, the custom was formed of depicting the symbols instead of the figure of the Blessed One, whom Nāgasena had taught was no longer visible except in the form of the dharmakaya of the "body of the doctrine." Having formulated this hypothesis, which rests also upon the assumption that the practice of making images of the Buddha and the habit of adoring them did not develop until four centuries after the Master's death, M. Foucher finds that it is confirmed in many ways and that from his premises "the whole subsequent development of Buddhist art flows logically." In the essay on "The Greek Origin of the Image of Buddha," he points out that the earliest known images of the Buddha are products of the art of Gandhāra, the frontier region which had been overrun by Alexander, and again, in 305 before our era, by Seleukos, and where Greek sculptors were introduced as early as the first if not the second century B.C. Despite its distinct Hellenistic flavor, however, the art of the district was not Greek but composite. It was Buddhist and therefore Indian in subject, and only Greek in treatment. Although the standing figure of Buddha at Hoti-Mardan, looked upon by M. Foucher as the most ancient and most beautiful Buddha figure known to him, is clearly reminiscent of a Hellenic prototype, it cannot be regarded as the typical Buddha. For that we must turn to the *seated* figure. Even as early as the time of the Buddha, as Dr. Coomaraswamy tells us, "the seated yogī, practising a mental discipline, or attaining the highest station of Samādhī, must have represented to the Indian mind the ultimate achievement of spiritual effort, and the attainment of the Great Quest." Here ready to hand was the appropriate form "to represent by a visible icon the figure of Him-who-had-thus-attained," and it cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called Greek in origin. But the representation of the Buddha with a full head of hair instead of with a shaven crown is distinctly a Greek innovation, and to that extent the typical Buddha may be said to be Greek.

The essay on "The Great Miracle of Cravāstī" is also of great interest. In it an explanation is offered of the representations of the Buddha surrounded by numerous miniature Buddhas. From the ancient and detailed account found in the Vinaya, M. Foucher tells us that on the invitation of King Prasenajit, the Blessed One accomplished two kinds of miracles. "At first he displays what in technical terms is called the yamakaprātihārya, which consists in walking in the air in various attitudes, while emitting alternately flames and waves from the upper and lower parts of his body: in the second place, multiplying images of himself up to heaven and in all directions, he preaches his law." The exposition of the treatment of this subject in art need not be set forth here, nor is space available to comment in detail upon the essays upon "The Representations of 'Jatakas' on the Bas-reliefs at Barhut," "The Eastern Gate of the Sānchī Stūpa," "The Six-Tusked Elephant," or "Buddhist Art in Java," all of which are of permanent value. The last essay is entitled "The Buddhist Madonna," a wall painting discovered by Dr. A. von Le Coq at Yar-Khoto near Turfan, a reproduction of which in color is given as a frontispiece. This painting we are invited to look at "no longer with eyes hereditarily Christian, but through Buddhist spectacles" when "we shall no less infallibly recognize in it, instead of the Virgin Mary nursing the Child Jesus, the fairy Hāriti suckling her last born, Pingala." There seems no reason to question this identification, though the figure is quite different from the usual representations of Hāriti and very like those of the Virgin Mary.

The exposition which the book affords of the painstaking methods with which M. Foucher attacks his problems is not the least of its merits. And he does not fail to let it appear, even when putting forth his conclusions most confidently, that he nevertheless is ready to revise his opinions, if need be, in the light of further evidence. A good index and numerous illustrations accompanied by detailed descriptions add to the usefulness of the book.

Hitherto, students seeking information concerning the history of Indian painting have had to turn to a few scholarly works, some of them technical and difficult, most of them expensive, and, being out of print, not readily available. The little book which Mr. Brown has prepared and which is published in the admirable "Heritage of India" series deserves a generous welcome. Only in size and price is the volume little. It is a sympathetic and remarkably full presentation of all that is known of the history of painting in India, beginning with an account of the frescoes at Ajanta, and taking up in turn the scanty evidences of the mediæval period; the works of the Mughal or Indo-Timurid artists; the native Indian or Hindū school, commonly known as Rājput though it is not exclusively the product of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rājputana district; and lastly the modern revival led by Abanindra Nath Tagore. This is followed by a description of the paintings of the several schools and of their distinctive features, and by a chapter on materials and technique. In every respect the book is a model of what a handbook should be; it is clear in statement, comprehensive in treatment, and informing. The illustrations serve their purpose excellently, there is a good index, a bibliography, and a list of the principal collections of Indian paintings.

Tales of Three Nations

The New Decameron. The Prologue and the First Day. Robert M. McBride and Company.

Square Peggy. By Josephine Daskam Bacon. D. Appleton and Company.

Temptations. By David Pinski. Brentano's.

IN an age of a thousand tellers of tales, it is a little strange that the plan of constructing a new Decameron through their collaboration has not been oftener attempted. All that is needed is the invention of some appropriate method by which the group of persons who are to tell the tales may be gathered. That has been done here by the natural and amusing device of "Turpin's Temperamental Tours"—tours of the Continent, of course—which lured a representative group of Britishers to a common adventure. That little company, however, recalls in no respect the blithe Florentines of Boccaccio. It does recall strongly both in its temper and, substituting the twentieth century for the fourteenth, in its aim, that other company which rode through the pleasant April weather toward the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury. There is a priest, though this time his tale is the briefest; there is a professor, a sorry person beside the Clerke of Oxenford, but of the same lineage; the master printer is evidently of the sturdy Miller's stock, though he is of course meticulously decent; there are a lady of fashion and a schoolmarm who in some strange and sly way tease one with memories of the Wife of Bath and the Prioress. It goes without saying that they are all proper and refined. And Chaucer would have been aghast at the woman doctor and the psychic researcher. But the parallel is unquestionably real, so real that the allusion to Boccaccio seems misleading.

The stories told by this company vary greatly in merit. What, again, they have in common is their English character, their virility touched by sentiment. Four of the ten stories have an element of the eerie and show a strong sense of the reality of mystical forces; love is touched upon in the decentest and most reticent way and plays a decisive part in only two of the tales. In one, The Upper Room, it partakes of the earth and is rebuked by a weird and exquisite fancy; in the other, The Tumbril Touch, its wildness and romance are quickly reduced to a proper domesticity. The longest and most powerful of the narratives included are, characteristically again, the Psychic Researcher's Tale, an uncommonly convincing story of the coldly horrible, the Detective's Friend's Tale, an extremely able example of a somewhat doubtful kind, and the Woman Doctor's Tale, a powerful little romantic tragedy that unites the English countryside with distant and exotic places. None of these tales are by authors of first-rate reputation; all are definitely insular in character. But none are worthless and the best are so competent and vigorous that a succession of many days of "The New Decameron" is to be desired—and indeed is promised by the authors on condition that this opening section proves a success with its public

America is the classical land of the short story. And we still have artists in this kind. We still have Mrs. Wharton and we now have Mr. Joseph Hergesheimer. But the spread of a glib technical proficiency and the high honorariums paid by a few ultra-popular magazines are producing a type of story marked by some very ugly qualities—a hard competence, a falseness of spiritual tone, a swagger determination to insist that appearance *is* reality and that all that has an appearance of glitter in our American life is gold. These stories seem not only intended to be read, but to have been written in the market-place, amid the clatter of the obvious, the noisy, and the false. It is precisely because Mrs. Bacon started out on her career in another and a gentler fashion that the tales in "Square Peggy" (originally copyrighted, of course, by the Curtis Publishing Company) are so deplorable. They are jaunty in manner and rattle along in a perfect whirl of emotional insincerity. They stop at no spiritual servility before worldly values. They give the impression of having been scribbled in a motor-car on its way from a war bazaar to a soup kitchen. Everybody in them is good-looking and rich, or about to become so, and terribly efficient and fashionable and proper and patriotic and glossy and successful and on the point of being married and living happily ever after. Nobody ever stops or thinks or feels or questions or meditates. Nobody is ever sick or sorry or perturbed of soul. If this is what we are coming to, the narrowest of old-fashioned creeds, with its stern insistence on the reality of spiritual forces, would be preferable. But, of course, we are coming to no such thing. It may not be useless, however, from time to time, to call attention to a kind of fiction whose swaggering dexterity may hide its inner hollowness from the unwary.

With David Pinski's "Temptations" we pass into an entirely different world. The true and deep difference of that world from Mrs. Bacon's and even from the world of "The New Decameron" does not, however, lie in the accidental diversities of race and custom. Mr. Pinski writes of the Jewish past and the Jewish present. Such is his necessary material. But he works in that lasting and universal world of the love of beauty and the search for truth in which the authentic artists of all peoples are brothers and at home. His presence among us is valuable not because of the interest that readers may take in the quaintness or the charm of his reports of Jewish life. It is valuable because he is an artist who bore obscurity serenely and takes his growing reputation calmly, but to whom it quite literally never occurred that he could abandon his vision or his method. He might have become Americanized in the popular and worthless sense and have written "Potash and Perlmutter" and joined the company of those who enjoy the emoluments of *The Saturday Evening Post.* Instead he has clung to his Yiddish speech and written in obscure places and kept his art delicate and pure.

Of the eight stories in this volume, four are naturalistic tales of proletarian life and probably belong to an earlier period of Mr. Pinski's development; four are historical and symbolical. The latter, though wholly Jewish in concrete character and substance, are human in the broadest sense and touch upon fundamental problems. "Beruriah," "The Temptations of Rabbi Akiba," and "Johanaan the High Priest," all deal with the conflict of the flesh and the spirit and illustrate strikingly how, in its insistence upon the reality and bitterness of that conflict, Christianity bases itself upon a Jewish tradition. "Beruriah" points to the spiritual beauty of that tradition; the story of the Rabbi Akiba to some of its practical dangers; the impressive story of the High Priest to the deep and aching sense of loss and disinheritance that must always be at its core. "Zerubbabel," a tale of the days of Queen Esther, is concerned with the permanent problem of resistance or non-resistance to force and is, despite its historical character, of acutely modern application. These stories glow with colors that are, at times, almost too sultry. The proletarian stories of contemporary life are done entirely in grey and black. They are sober renditions of very sterile lives. But they, too, especially the very notable novelette "Drabkin," have the intellectual and universal implications without which art is apt to be too frail and too perishable.

NOTE.—In the review of "Heritage" (Doran) in the issue of *The Nation* for September 13, the author, "V. Sackville West," was referred to as a man. It seems, however, that the name is only a pseudonym used by the Honorable Mrs. Harold Nicolson, daughter of the present Lord Sackville.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

JOURNALISTIC criticism, at least in America, has seldom the basis in wide reading or the balance and clarity of judgment that distinguish Robert Lynd's "Old and New Masters" (Scribners). Less rare, perhaps, are Mr. Lynd's other merits—a keen eye for the picturesque and suggestive in character and incident, and a gift of quotable phrase. Readers are likely to remember, for instance, that Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Belloc are "the great Twin Brethren, who fought so well for Rome," and that Swinburne "did not write quite like a human being. He wrote like a musical instrument." The twenty-seven short essays, which have appeared in various London journals, range in subject from Jane Austen to Dostoevsky and from Wordsworth to Strindberg; the bulk of them, however, deal with authors living or recently dead. Some of them have the one-sidedness of the book review; thus the essay on Hardy treats only his poetry, though the critic is careful to point out the absurdity of the notion that Hardy is greater as poet than as novelist. Like many of the critical craft Mr. Lynd tends to be more generous to the lesser lights than to the greater. We may reasonably doubt whether, as he seems to think, any poem of James Elroy Flecker's will interest anybody after a thousand years; and we may vigorously dispute his assertion that in Mr. Masefield's lines "we miss . . . the onward march of poetry." If we miss it there, where, in heaven's name, do we find it? Mr. Lynd makes partial amends later by just praise of some great lines in "Dauber." The essay on Kipling, "the little Anglo-Indian Prussian who sings hymns of hate and Hempire," stresses his faults heavily and says little of his virtues; but how accurately are those faults distinguished—his "droning on the harmonium of imperialism," his "mistaking knowingness for knowledge," his vulgarity about women. Tonic also are the negations of the essay on Swinburne: "It is impossible to persuade oneself that he was ever among the genuine poets of liberty. He loved insurrectionism for its own sake. He revelled in it in the spirit of a rhetorician rather than in that of a martyr." "Nearly all his poems are a little too long, a little tedious, for the simple reason that the muzziness of vision in them . . . is bewildering to the intelligence." Here is a critic who can deny; he can praise also, and his praise has meaning.

THE satisfaction of saying "I told you so" is enjoyed to the full by Colonel Repington, the well-known military expert of *The Times* (London). In the concluding chapters of his reminiscences of peace and war, "Vestigia" (Houghton Mifflin), he reviews triumphantly his activity during the dozen years before the war in proclaiming the danger to England from Germany's designs and in preaching and promoting important reforms in the British army. The predictions that he made in *The Times* and *Blackwood's* prove that his wisdom was not based on hindsight. As a military attaché in several European capitals he availed himself of his opportunities and obtained an understanding of the Continental policies underlying military programmes which was almost as uncommon among British politicians as in this country. His comments on the Hague Conference, in which he took part, are instructive. He expresses frankly his disbelief in agreements for limiting armaments and maintains that the only hope of stopping wars is in compulsory arbitration. But he does not indicate by what means arbitration is to be made compulsory, and comes very close to suggesting that the cessation of wars offers a more comfortable prospect for the great nations than for the smaller ones. The whole business is summed up in a couple of airy sentences: "I had come to the Hague from one war [in the Sudan], had signed on for the millennium, and now departed for another war [in South Africa]. Whatever else life was, it was certainly not dull." The account of the campaigns in which he shared, campaigns which increased the Empire by territory equal to the whole area of the United States, take up the bulk of Colonel Repington's volume. His part was a distinguished and gallant one and it brought him into direct contact with Kitchener and Buller, of whom he contributes illuminating glimpses. The earlier chapters reveal the pedigreed English youth with whom we are familiar, addicted in his youth to outdoor sports and schoolboy pranks and disdainful of intellectual pursuits but educated to responsibility by the consciousness of belonging to the ruling class of the race ordained by fate to civilize the whole barbarian world. The question of England's rightness and righteousness is never raised by Colonel Repington. The air of superiority sits lightly upon him. But there is charm in his narrative and it is seasoned with many amusing stories. The timeliest one is that of the German officer who was taken to see the Derby, and on viewing the enormous crowd that had gathered, exclaimed: "Ach! what a mark for shrapnel!"

POLITICAL equality, even in theory, cannot exist along with absolute monarchy, not to say despotism, in industry. The shop committee plan, which brings employees into direct relations with employers, has in it particular promise for industrial peace. From his experience as an administrator for the National War Labor Board, Mr. William Leavitt Stoddard brings out in an interesting way in a small book entitled "The Shop Committee" (Macmillan) the facts concerning this new system for which the claim is made that it furnishes for both workingman and employer the ideal intra-factory machinery for eliminating friction, bringing about good relations, and promoting the practice and extension of real collective bargaining. The author reviews briefly the British experience, dealing particularly with the Whitley report, and also the plan of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, which is the earliest notable example in this country of the development of a shop committee system. Several plans as worked out by the National War Labor Board are given in detail, together with accounts of how these plans have been applied in various plants. In the appendix are given the report on works committees, supplementary to the Whitley report, and a list of the shop committee systems which are now being tried in various plants in this country.

THE part played by the doughnut, not less than that played by the doughboy, in winning the war is set forth in "The War Romance of the Salvation Army" (Lippincott) by Mrs. Flavius J. Lutz (Grace Livingston Hill) under the inspiration of Commander Evangeline Booth, who contributes some prefatory pages. The work is based upon personal narratives and correspondence furnished by Salvation Army members and others who were in France and have brought back vivid details from the various sectors where the "Sallies" gave moral and material support to our soldiers. From the first compelling impulse that made the mission of the Salvationists in France an inescapable duty, through the manifold activities of the ministering lassies at and near the battle front, the story is well and fully told—a history of high-hearted heroism and of self-forgetful courage.

THE alert social worker will find in Joanna C. Colcord's "Broken Homes" (Russell Sage Foundation) valuable suggestions for proceeding in his or her "case" work in the problem of desertion. He will find in it an excellent summary of the factors which lead to desertion; factors inherent in the man or woman and those inherent in the social environment; methods of treatment and the change in emphasis in treatment; methods of finding the deserter and of making for the thorough reconciliation. Miss Colcord has not been content to write out of the fulness of her own experience but has included also the suggestions of other social workers. This book was written to instruct and to suggest and, as such, it fulfills the writer's intention.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

Comedy and Tragi-Comedy

THE mood of comedy is one but rarely sustained upon our stage, possibly for the reason that comedy arises from an exercise of the discriminating intelligence; it is the battle ground of the liberated mind; its function is not only to show life, but to show it up. Only a very bold critic would therefore promise a season's "run" for Mr. W. Somerset Maugham's "Too Many Husbands" (The Booth Theatre). The present texture of the play shows concessions to a less stringent taste; there are bits of speech and especially bits of "business" that betray clearly enough the rumored revision by that indefatigable tinkerer Mr. Willard Mack. But neither these nor the touching care of the reviewers to leave the true qualities of the play undefined will long deceive the dullest. Behind the laughter and the lightness of the performance there will soon be felt the presence of the same penetrating and vigilant spirit that created "Of Human Bondage" and "The Moon and Sixpence."

The fable of the play is one that the war has brought into fashion, although a literary or dramatic use of its emotional values is at least as old as "Enoch Arden" or "East Lynne." A spouse returns and finds his or her place occupied by an usurper. Here, the melodramatist reasons, is an unfailing source of sympathetic tears, and in the necessary reconciliation of the original pair a conclusion as delightful as it is correct. But suppose, Mr. Maugham says, that the lady in the case, though personally most charming, is an unmitigated nuisance—selfish, extravagant, light-minded, light-hearted, and unscrupulous. And suppose, also, that the husband reported dead on the field of battle was thoroughly aware of this, and that the second husband had had ample time and opportunity to learn it. Then suppose, finally, that both gentlemen are members of the British military caste, and are nothing so little as articulate and are accustomed to hide all emotional realities behind a conventional gesture. What then? The two gentlemen will naturally vie with each other in the nobility of their unselfishness, each desperately hoping that this act of renunciation will be accepted. In this contrast between their real desires and their inevitable posturing lies the genuine comic force as well as the larger irony of the play. That larger irony, like the irony of Shaw, is directed against the emotional unveracity amid which most people live. It castigates with its laughter not only the people on the stage, but also those in the audience who expected a conventional fable to arouse the expected emotions and draw toward the falseness of a common conclusion. To disappoint that expectation, to strip the audience as well as the characters of their vain pretenses—such is the true and bracing business of the comic spirit. The lady of Mr. Maugham's play turns out to be the only realist of them all. She has the courage of all her qualities and plays the conventional game with but the lightest touch. She will not accept the sacrifice of either of her adored ones; her clear and calculating eye is already upon a wealthier, older, and therefore more pliant *tertium quid*.

The interpretation of the three chief characters is very nearly faultless. Miss Estelle Winwood, who was far too languishing in sentimental parts last season, shows herself a comic actress capable of the nicest shadings and of a refreshing frugality and convincingness of technical means; Mr. Lawrence Grossmith and Mr. Kenneth Douglas admirably reveal and differentiate two slight but definite variations of a single human type.

Miss Zoë Akins, to judge from her ill-fated "Papa," was not incapable of that penetration of vision that comedy demands. She may also be capable, for all we know, of the deeper and more brooding vision of tragedy. What is certain is that "Déclassée" (The Empire Theatre) is neither. A brilliant opening, the glamor of Miss Ethel Barrymore's personality, a pretty literary skill in the dialogue can no more save the play than the clumsy stage management of the second act can mar it. The trouble lies deeper. A great lady who has the helplessness of inveterate luxury but an honorable mind may well, through circumstances created by her own character, drift into a twilight social world. But what becomes of the honor of her mind if she continues a mere moth to the flame of her former position and never seeks the simpler and the truer values that are within the grasp of all? Her tragedy might, of course, have been sought in that very weakness, in that ultimate limitation. But it is not there that Miss Akins sees it. Lady Helen must be killed by a taxicab because her last pearl is sold and a magnificent *parti* eludes her. By a terrible bit of stage trickery the possible poignancy of even this poor situation is lost. For Rudolph Solomon had not meant to withdraw at all. The most eloquent and sagacious of men, according to Miss Akins, he is forced to commit a stupid verbal blunder, since otherwise Lady Helen could never have been driven out into the night and under the wheels of her appointed taxi. Even so the poor woman is not allowed to die in peace. She is brought in with a broken back and like Audrie Lesden in the insufferable last act of Henry Arthur Jones's "Michael and His Lost Angel," discourses touchingly for twelve minutes. Nothing was lacking but "soft music." It is clear enough, to be sure, that Miss Akins's play is on a higher plane of endeavor than the average pieces of our stage; it is not clear that anything but a far more consistent austerity of execution can help us at all.

Miss Barrymore plays Lady Helen Haden. She plays the part, as she has played many others, as she played even "Mrs. McChesney" some years ago, with a gentle, sunset humor, a liquid note of pathos in her lovely voice, a gracious wondering innocence of glance and movement and gesture. A charming and endearing personality. But a great actress? Hardly! For what one thinks of is always of how well Miss Barrymore does it all and how little influence time has had upon the personal qualities which show no staleness, but also no variety, no flexibility, no inner growth. She plays merely herself; and Mr. Claude King, in his by no means first rate identification of himself with the character of Rudolph Solomon, offers a sounder example of the art of acting. The dazzling light of the hour is on the play and the player. But in neither is there that trait of the permanent in truth or beauty which can stir the memory of tomorrow.

L. L.

"A vivid narrative of mighty reactions"
says HORACE TRAUBEL of
THE PROTESTANT
By BURRIS A. JENKINS
The author calls it "A scrap-book for insurgents." Dr. Jenkins, Kansas City's leading minister and editor of the Kansas City Post, believes in the church, but he flames with wrath at the hypocrisy and weakness of conventional church life. He demands a new leadership to bring the church out from the autocracy of Protestantism into the freedom of the new day. $1.35, plus 10 cents postage.
THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY PRESS
716 East 40th Street *CHICAGO, ILLINOIS*

Whatever book you want
Wanamaker's
has it, or will get it.
We buy old, rare books, and sets of books
NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation

International Relations Section

Contents

THE BOLSHEVIST BOGY AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE 549

THE EUROPEAN CHAOS. A Letter from Austin Harrison 553

The Bolshevist Bogy at the Peace Conference

THE following "Notes on Conversations Held in the Office of M. Pichon at the Quai d'Orsay, on January 16, 1919" and "Secretaries' Notes of a Conversation" held at the same place on January 21—the latter marked "Secret," form a part of the written testimony presented by Mr. William C. Bullitt to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 12. With slight typographical corrections, the text of the documents here reproduced is taken from the report of the hearings published by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Lloyd George commenced his statement setting forth the information in the possession of the British Government regarding the Russian situation, by referring to the matter which had been exposed recently in *L'Humanité*. He stated that he wished to point out that there had been a serious misconception on the part of the French Government as to the character of the proposal of the British Government. The British proposal did not contemplate in any sense whatever, a recognition of the Bolshevik Government, nor a suggestion that Bolshevik delegates be invited to attend the Conference. The British proposal was to invite all of the different governments now at war within what used to be the Russian Empire, to a truce of God, to stop reprisals and outrages and to send men here to give, so to speak, an account of themselves. The Great Powers would then try to find a way to bring some order out of chaos. These men were not to be delegates to the Peace Conference, and he agreed with the French Government entirely that they should not be made members of the Conference.

Mr. Lloyd George then proceeded to set forth briefly the reasons which had led the British Government to make this proposal. They were as follows:

Firstly, the real facts are not known;

Secondly, it is impossible to get the facts, the only way is to adjudicate the question; and

Thirdly, conditions in Russia are very bad; there is general mis-government and starvation. It is not known who is obtaining the upper hand, but the hope that the Bolshevik Government would collapse had not been realized. In fact, there is one report that the Bolsheviki are stronger than ever, that their internal position is strong, and that their hold on the people is stronger. Take, for instance, the case of the Ukraine. Some adventurer raises a few men and overthrows the Government. The Government is incapable of overthrowing him. It is also reported that the peasants are becoming Bolsheviki. It is hardly the business of the Great Powers to intervene either in lending financial support to one side or the other, or in sending munitions to either side.

Mr. Lloyd George stated that there seemed to be three possible policies:

1. Military intervention. It is true that the Bolshevik movement is as dangerous to civilization as German militarism, but as to putting it down by the sword, is there anyone who proposes it? It would mean holding a certain number of vast provinces in Russia. The Germans with one million men on their Eastern front only held the fringe of this territory. If he now proposed to send a thousand British troops to Russia for that purpose, the armies would mutiny. The same applies to U. S. troops in Siberia; also to Canadians and French as well. The mere idea of crushing Bolshevism by a military force is pure madness. Even admitting that it is done, who is to occupy Russia? No one can conceive or understand bringing about order by force.

2. A cordon. The second suggestion is to besiege Bolshevik Russia. Mr. Lloyd George wondered if those present realized what this would mean. From the information furnished him, Bolshevik Russia has no corn, but within this territory there are 150,000,000 men, women, and children. There is now starvation in Petrograd and Moscow. This is not an health cordon, it is a death cordon. Moreover, as a matter of fact, the people who would die are just the people that the Allies desire to protect. It would not result in the starvation of the Bolsheviki; it would simply mean the death of our friends. The cordon policy is a policy which, as humane people, those present could not consider.

Mr. Lloyd George asked who was there to overthrow the Bolsheviki? He had been told there were three men, Denikin, Kolchak, and Knox. In considering the chances of these people to overthrow the Bolsheviki, he pointed out that he had received information that the Czecho-Slovaks now refused to fight; that the Russian army was not to be trusted, and that while it was true that a Bolshevik army had recently gone over to Kolchak it was never certain that just the reverse of this would not take place. If the Allies counted on any of these men, he believed they were building on quick-sand. He had heard a lot of talk about Denikin, but when he looked on the map he found that Denikin was occupying a little backyard near the Black Sea. Then he had been told that Denikin had recognized Kolchak, but when he looked on the map there was a great solid block of territory between Denikin and Kolchak. Moreover, from information received it would appear that Kolchak had been collecting members of the old régime around him, and would seem to be at heart a monarchist. It appeared that the Czecho-Slovaks were finding this out. The sympathies of the Czecho-Slovaks are very democratic, and they are not at all prepared to fight for the restoration of the old conditions in Russia.

Mr. Lloyd George stated that he was informed that at the present time two-thirds of Bolshevik Russia was starving.

Institutions of Bolsheviki are institutions of old Czarist régime. This is not what one would call creating a new world.

3. The third alternative was contained in the British proposal, which was to summon these people to Paris to appear before those present, somewhat in the way that the Roman Empire summoned chiefs of outlying tributary states to render an account of their actions.

Mr. Lloyd George pointed out the fact that the argument might be used that there were already here certain representa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives of these Governments; but take, for instance, the case of Sazonov, who claims to represent the Government of Omsk. As a matter of fact Sazonov cannot speak from personal observation. He is nothing but a partisan, like all the rest. He has never been in contact, and is not now in direct contact with the Government at Omsk.

It would be manifestly absurd for those who are responsible for bringing about the Peace Conference, to come to any agreement and leave Paris when one-half of Europe and one-half of Asia is still in flames. Those present must settle this question or make fools of themselves.

Mr. Lloyd George referred to the objection that had been raised to permitting Bolshevik delegates to come to Paris. It had been claimed that they would convert France and England to Bolshevism. If England becomes Bolshevist, it will not be because a single Bolshevist representative is permitted to enter England. On the other hand, if a military enterprise were started against the Bolsheviki, that would make England Bolshevist, and there would be a Soviet in London. For his part, Mr. Lloyd George was not afraid of Bolshevism if the facts are known in England and the United States. The same applied to Germany. He was convinced that an educated democracy can be always trusted to turn down Bolshevism.

Under all circumstances, Mr. Lloyd George saw no better way out than to follow the third alternative. Let the Great Powers impose their conditions and summon these people to Paris to give an account of themselves to the Great Powers, not to the Peace Conference.

M. Pichon suggested that it might be well to ask M. Noulens, the French Ambassador to Russia, who had just returned to France, to appear before the meeting tomorrow morning, and give those present his views on the Russian situation.

President Wilson stated that he did not see how it was possible to controvert the statement of Mr. Lloyd George. He thought that there was a force behind this discussion which was no doubt in his mind, but which it might be desirable to bring out a little more definitely. He did not believe that there would be sympathy anywhere with the brutal aspect of Bolshevism, if it were not for the fact of the domination of large vested interests in the political and economic world. While it might be true that this evil was in process of discussion and slow reform, it must be admitted, that the general body of men have grown impatient at the failure to bring about the necessary reform. He stated that there were many men who represented large vested interests in the United States who saw the necessity for these reforms and desired something which should be worked out at the Peace Conference—namely, the establishment of some machinery to provide for the opportunity of the individual greater than the world has ever known. Capital and labor in the United States are not friends. Still they are not enemies in the sense that they are thinking of resorting to physical force to settle their differences. But they are distrustful, each of the other. Society cannot go on that plane. On the one hand, there is a minority possessing capital and brains; on the other, a majority consisting of the great bodies of workers who are essential to the minority, but do not trust the minority, and feel that the minority will never render them their rights. A way must be found to put trust and coöperation between these two.

President Wilson pointed out that the whole world was disturbed by this question before the Bolsheviki came into power. Seeds need soil, and the Bolshevik seeds found the soil already prepared for them.

President Wilson stated that he would not be surprised to find that the reason why British and United States troops would not be ready to enter Russia to fight the Bolsheviki was explained by the fact that the troops were not at all sure that if they put down Bolshevism they would not bring about a reëstablishment of the ancient order. For example, in making a speech recently, to a well-dressed audience in New York City who were not to be expected to show such feeling, Mr. Wilson had referred casually to Russia, stating that the United States would do its utmost to aid her suppressed people. The audience exhibited the greatest enthusiasm, and this had remained in the President's mind as an index to where the sympathies of the New World are.

President Wilson believed that those present would be playing against the principle of the free spirit of the world if they did not give Russia a chance to find herself along the lines of utter freedom. He concurred with Mr. Lloyd George's view and supported his recommendations that the third line of procedure be adopted.

President Wilson stated that he had also, like Mr. Lloyd George, received a memorandum from his experts which agreed substantially with the information which Mr. Lloyd George had received. There was one point which he thought particularly worthy of notice, and that was the report that the strength of the Bolshevik leaders lay in the argument that if they were not supported by the people of Russia, there would be foreign intervention, and the Bolsheviki were the only thing that stood between the Russians and foreign military control. It might well be that if the Bolsheviki were assured that they were safe from foreign aggression, they might lose support of their own movement.

President Wilson further stated that he understood that the danger of destruction of all hope in the Baltic provinces was immediate, and that it should be made very clear if the British proposal were adopted, that the Bolsheviki would have to withdraw entirely from Lithuania and Poland. If they would agree to this [and] to refrain from reprisals and outrages, he, for his part, would be prepared to receive representatives from as many groups and centers of action, as chose to come, and endeavor to assist them to reach a solution of their problem.

He thought that the British proposal contained the only suggestion that lead anywhere. It might lead nowhere. But this could at least be found out.

M. Pichon referred again to the suggestion that Ambassador Noulens be called before the meeting.

Mr. Balfour suggested that it might be well to call the Dutch Consul, lately in Petrograd, if it was the desire of those present to hear the anti-Bolshevik side.

Baron Sonnino suggested that M. Scavenius, Minister of Denmark, recently in Russia, would be able to give interesting data on the Russian situation.

Those present seemed to think that it might be desirable to hear what these gentlemen might have to say.

[McD. Secret. I. C. 114. Secretaries' notes of a conversation held in M. Pichon's room at the Quai d'Orsay on Tuesday, January 21, 1919, at 15 hours.]

PRESENT

United States of America: President Wilson, Mr. R. Lansing, Mr. A. H. Frazier, Col. U. S. Grant, Mr. L. Harrison.

British Empire: The Right Hon. D. Lloyd George, The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, Lieut.-Col. Sir M. P. A. Hankey, K. C. B., Maj. A. M. Caccia, M. V. O., Mr. E. Phipps.

France: M. Clemenceau, M. Pichon, M. Dutasta, M. Berthelot, Capt. A. Potier.

Italy: Signor Orlando, H. E. Baron Sonnino, Count Aldrovandi, Maj. A. Jones.

Japan: Baron Makino, H. E. M. Matsui, M. Saburi.

Interpreter, Prof. P. J. Mantoux.

M. Clemenceau said they had met together to decide what could be done in Russia under present circumstances.

President Wilson said that in order to have something definite to discuss, he wished to take advantage of a suggestion made by Mr. Lloyd George and to propose a modification of the British proposal. He wished to suggest that the various organized groups in Russia should be asked to send representatives, not to Paris, but to some other place, such as Salonika, convenient of approach, there to meet such representatives as might be appointed by the Allies, in order to see if they could draw up a programme upon which agreement could be reached.

Mr. Lloyd George pointed out that the advantage of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

would be that they could be brought straight there from Russia through the Black Sea without passing through other countries.

M. Sonnino said that some of the representatives of the various Governments were already here in Paris; for example, M. Sazonov. Why should these not be heard?

President Wilson expressed the view that the various parties should not be heard separately. It would be very desirable to get all these representatives in one place, and still better, all in one room, in order to obtain a close comparison of views.

Mr. Balfour said that a further objection to Mr. Sonnino's plan was that if M. Sazonov was heard in Paris, it would be difficult to refuse to hear the others in Paris also, and M. Clemenceau objected strongly to having some of these representatives in Paris.

M. Sonnino explained that all the Russian parties had some representatives here, except the Soviets, whom they did not wish to hear. . . .

Mr. Lloyd George remarked that the Bolshevists were the very people some of them wished to hear.

M. Sonnino, continuing, said that they had heard M. Litvinov's statements* that morning.

The Allies were now fighting against the Bolshevists who were their enemies, and therefore they were not obliged to hear them with the others.

Mr. Balfour remarked that the essence of President Wilson's proposal was that the parties must all be heard at one and the same time.

Mr. Lloyd George expressed the view that the acceptance of M. Sonnino's proposals would amount to their hearing a string of people, all of whom held the same opinion, and all of whom would strike the same note. But they would not hear the people who at the present moment were actually controlling European Russia. In deference to M. Clemenceau's views, they had put forward this new proposal. He thought it would be quite safe to bring the Bolshevist representatives to Salonika, or perhaps to Lemnos. It was absolutely necessary to endeavor to make peace. The report read by President Wilson that morning went to show that the Bolshevists were not convinced of the error of their ways, but they apparently realized the folly of their present methods. Therefore they were endeavoring to come to terms.

President Wilson asked to be permitted to urge one aspect of the case. As M. Sonnino had implied, they were all repelled by Bolshevism, and for that reason they had placed armed men in opposition to them. One of the things that was clear in the Russian situation was that by opposing Bolshevism with arms, they were in reality serving the cause of Bolshevism. The Allies were making it possible for the Bolsheviki to argue that imperialistic and capitalistic Governments were endeavoring to exploit the country and to give the land back to the landlords, and so bring about a reaction. If it could be shown that this was not true, and that the Allies were prepared to deal with the rulers of Russia, much of the moral force of this argument would disappear. The allegation that the Allies were against the people and wanted to control their affairs provided the argument which enabled them to raise armies. If, on the other hand, the Allies could swallow their pride and the natural repulsion which they felt for the Bolshevists and see the representatives of all organized groups in one place, he thought it would bring about a marked reaction against Bolshevism.

M. Clemenceau said that, in principle, he did not favor conversation with the Bolshevists; not because they were criminals, but because we would be raising them to our level by saying that they were worthy of entering into conversation with us. The Bolshevist danger was very great at the present moment. Bolshevism was spreading. It had invaded the Baltic Provinces and Poland, and that very morning they received very bad news regarding its spread to Budapest and Vienna. Italy, also, was in danger. The danger was probably greater there than in France. If Bolshevism, after spreading in Germany, were to traverse Austria and Hungary and so reach Italy, Europe would be faced with a very great danger. Therefore, something must be done against Bolshevism. When listening to the document presented by President Wilson that morning, he had been struck by the cleverness with which the Bolshevists were attempting to lay a trap for the Allies. When the Bolshevists first came into power, a breach was made with the capitalist Government on questions of principle, but now they offered funds and concessions as a basis for treating with them. He need not say how valueless their promises were, but if they were listened to, the Bolshevists would go back to their people and say: "We offered them great principles of justice and the Allies would have nothing to do with us. Now we offer money, and they are ready to make peace."

He admitted his remarks did not offer a solution. The great misfortune was that the Allies were in need of a speedy solution. After four years of war, and the losses and sufferings they had incurred, their populations could stand no more. Russia also was in need of immediate peace. But its necessary evolution must take time. The signing of the world peace could not await Russia's final avatar. Had time been available, he would suggest waiting, for eventually sound men representing commonsense would come to the top. But when would that be? He could make no forecast. Therefore they must press for an early solution.

To sum up, had he been acting by himself, he would temporize and erect barriers to prevent Bolshevism from spreading. But he was not alone, and in the presence of his colleagues he felt compelled to make some concession, as it was essential that there should not be even the appearance of disagreement amongst them. The concession came easier after having heard President Wilson's suggestions. He thought that they should make a very clear and convincing appeal to all reasonable peoples, emphatically stating that they did not wish in any way to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia, and especially that they had no intention of restoring Czardom. The object of the Allies being to hasten the creation of a strong government, they proposed to call together representatives of all parties to a conference. He would beg President Wilson to draft a paper, fully explaining the position of the Allies to the whole world, including the Russians and the Germans.

Mr. Lloyd George agreed and gave notice that he wished to withdraw his own motion in favor of President Wilson's.

Mr. Balfour said that he understood that all these people were to be asked on an equality. On these terms he thought the Bolshevists would refuse, and by their refusal, they would put themselves in a very bad position.

M. Sonnino said that he did not agree that the Bolshevists would not come. He thought they would be the first to come, because they would be eager to put themselves on an equality with the others. He would remind his colleagues that, before the peace of Brest-Litovsk was signed, the Bolshevists promised all sorts of things, such as to refrain from propaganda, but since that peace had been concluded they had broken all their promises, their one idea being to spread revolution in all other countries. His idea was to collect together all the anti-Bolshevik parties and help them to make a strong government, provided they pledged themselves not to serve the forces of reaction and especially not to touch the land question, thereby depriving the Bolshevists of their strongest argument. Should they take these pledges, he would be prepared to help them.

Mr. Lloyd George inquired how this help would be given.

M. Sonnino replied that help would be given with soldiers to a reasonable degree or by supplying arms, food, and money. For instance, Poland asked for weapons and munitions; the Ukraine asked for weapons. All the Allies wanted was to establish a strong government. The reason that no strong government at present existed was that no party could risk taking the offensive against Bolshevism without the assistance of the Allies. He

* [This statement was made to W. H. Buckler, attaché of the American embassy in London, who had been sent to Stockholm to confer with Litvinov, formerly unrecognized Soviet representative at London. Buckler's telegrams were read *in extenso* to the Council of Ten by President Wilson. Litvinov had said that the Bolsheviki would agree to an armistice on the Archangel front at any time, and would pledge themselves not to injure in any way those Russians in and about Archangel who had been coöperating with the Allies.—Editor.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would inquire how the parties of order could possibly succeed without the help of the Allies. President Wilson had said that they should put aside all pride in the matter. He would point out that, for Italy and probably for France also, as M. Clemenceau had stated, it was in reality a question of self-defence. He thought that even a partial recognition of the Bolshevists would strengthen their position, and, speaking for himself, he thought that Bolshevism was already a serious danger in his country.

Mr. Lloyd George said he wished to put one or two practical questions to M. Sonnino. The British Empire now had some 15,000 to 20,000 men in Russia. M. de Scavenius had estimated that some 150,000 additional men would be required, in order to keep the anti-Bolshevist Governments from dissolution. And General Franchet d'Esperey also insisted on the necessity of Allied assistance. Now Canada had decided to withdraw her troops, because the Canadian soldiers would not agree to stay and fight against the Russians. Similar trouble had also occurred amongst the other Allied troops. And he felt certain that, if the British tried to send any more troops there, there would be mutiny.

M. Sonnino suggested that volunteers might be called for.

Mr. Lloyd George, continuing, said that it would be impossible to raise 150,000 men in that way. He asked, however, what contributions America, Italy, and France would make towards the raising of this army.

President Wilson and M. Clemenceau each said none.

M. Orlando agreed that Italy could make no further contributions.

Mr. Lloyd George said that the Bolshevists had an army of 300,000 men who would, before long, be good soldiers, and to fight them at least 400,000 Russian soldiers would be required. Who would feed, equip, and pay them? Would Italy, or America, or France, do so? If they were unable to do that, what would be the good of fighting Bolshevism? It could not be crushed by speeches. He sincerely trusted that they would accept President Wilson's proposal as it now stood.

M. Orlando agreed that the question was a very difficult one for the reasons that had been fully given. He agreed that Bolshevism constituted a grave danger to all Europe. To prevent a contagious epidemic from spreading, the sanitarians set up a *cordon sanitaire*. If similar measures could be taken against Bolshevism, in order to prevent its spreading, it might be overcome, since to isolate it meant vanquishing it. Italy was now passing through a period of depression, due to war weariness. But Bolshevists could never triumph there, unless they found a favorable medium, such as might be produced either by a profound patriotic disappointment in their expectations as to the rewards of the war, or by an economic crisis. Either might lead to revolution, which was equivalent to Bolshevism. Therefore, he would insist that all possible measures should be taken to set up this cordon. Next, he suggested the consideration of repressive measures. He thought two methods were possible: either the use of physical force or the use of moral force. He thought Mr. Lloyd George's objection to the use of physical force unanswerable. The occupation of Russia meant the employment of large numbers of troops for an indefinite period of time. This meant an apparent prolongation of the war. There remained the use of moral force. He agreed with M. Clemenceau that no country could continue in anarchy and that an end must eventually come; but they could not wait; they could not proceed to make peace and ignore Russia. Therefore, Mr. Lloyd George's proposal, with the modifications introduced after careful consideration by President Wilson and M. Clemenceau, gave a possible solution. It did not involve entering into negotiations with the Bolsheviki; the proposal was merely an attempt to bring together all the parties in Russia with a view to finding a way out of the present difficulty. He was prepared, therefore, to support it.

President Wilson asked for the views of his Japanese colleagues.

Baron Makino said that after carefully considering the various points of view put forward, he had no objections to make regarding the conclusion reached. He thought that was the best solution under the circumstances. He wished, however, to enquire what attitude would be taken by the representatives of the Allied Powers if the Bolshevists accepted the invitation to the meeting and there insisted upon their principles. He thought they should under no circumstances countenance Bolshevist ideas. The conditions in Siberia east of the Baikal had greatly improved. The objects which had necessitated the dispatch of troops to that region had been attained. Bolshevism was no longer aggressive, though it might still persist in a latent form. In conclusion, he wished to support the proposal before the meeting.

President Wilson expressed the view that the emissaries of the Allied Powers should not be authorized to adopt any definite attitude towards Bolshevism. They should merely report back to their Governments the conditions found.

Mr. Lloyd George asked that that question be further considered. He thought the emissaries of the Allied Powers should be able to establish an agreement if they were able to find a solution. For instance, if they succeeded in reaching an agreement on the subject of the organization of a Constituent Assembly, they should be authorized to accept such a compromise without the delay of a reference to the Governments.

President Wilson suggested that the emissaries might be furnished with a body of instructions.

Mr. Balfour expressed the view that abstention from hostile action against their neighbors should be made a condition of their sending representatives to this meeting.

President Wilson agreed.

M. Clemenceau suggested that the manifesto to the Russian parties should be based solely on humanitarian grounds. They should say to the Russians: "You are threatened by famine. We are prompted by humanitarian feelings; we are making peace; we do not want people to die. We are prepared to see what can be done to remove the menace of starvation." He thought the Russians would at once prick up their ears, and be prepared to hear what the Allies had to say. They would add that food cannot be sent unless peace and order were reëstablished. It should, in fact, be made quite clear that the representatives of all parties would merely be brought together for purely humane reasons.

Mr. Lloyd George said that in this connection he wished to invite attention to a doubt expressed by certain of the delegates of the British Dominions—namely, whether there would be enough food and credit to go round should an attempt be made to feed all Allied countries, and enemy countries, and Russia also. The export of so much food would inevitably have the effect of raising food prices in Allied countries and so create discontent and Bolshevism. As regards grain, Russia had always been an exporting country, and there was evidence to show that plenty of food at present existed in the Ukraine.

President Wilson said that his information was that enough food existed in Russia, but, either on account of its being hoarded or on account of difficulties of transportation, it could not be made available.

(It was agreed that President Wilson should draft a proclamation, for consideration at the next meeting, inviting all organized parties in Russia to attend a meeting to be held at some selected place such as Salonika or Lemnos, in order to discuss with the representatives of the Allied and Associated Great Powers the means of restoring order and peace in Russia. Participation in the meeting should be conditional on a cessation of hostilities.)

ACCORDING to recent information in *Folkets Dagblad Politiken* (Stockholm), the Congress of Swedish Metal Workers sent a committee to Foreign Minister Hellner demanding that relations be resumed with Soviet Russia. The Minister replied that any attempt by Sweden to break the blockade or to protect Swedish ships by military convoy would result in war with the Entente and that, consequently, the resumption of diplomatic or commercial relations with Soviet Russia was impossible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The European Chaos

THE following letter from Mr. Austin Harrison, editor of *The English Review*, appeared in *The Manchester Guardian* of August 30, under the caption, Balkanized Europe:

SIR: The "fruits" of the six months' secret covenants at Paris are now falling off the trees of hope, as it were, all over Europe, which, instead of peace, has on all sides war and chaos. Six months after the Armistice, after Hungary has been disarmed, Rumania walks in under French generals and loots; takes away even typewriting machines, substituting a Grand Duke. Poland is making war on Lithuania and has seized the oil of Ukrainian Russia. Now the Czecho-Slovaks are mobilizing against the Poles. Ukrainia, which supported Denikin in his advance, now withdraws because Denikin refuses to recognize Ukrainia's independence, and this may lead to a débâcle of Denikin's army. With Turkey and Bulgaria the Supreme Council seem unable even to attempt peace, chiefly because the "Big Two" want America to accept the Constantinople mandate and so get her "roped in," whereas the Republicans won't hear of mandates involving America in European tribal and religious warfare. Italy sulks. The Poles are in insurrection in Silesia, clearly in connection with the coming plébiscite, and in that portion of Denmark where there is also to be a plébiscite, a French dreadnaught appears to ensure "liberty." Frantic confusion reigns over the rival claims to Macedonia. Fearsome feelings are raging over our Arabian "democracy," the French claiming Syria, we assimilating Persia, or the important Fusein family, thereby giving the "knock" to any idea of League of Nations law, while Shantung and 40,000,000 Chinamen are transferred to Japan. Even in Alsace-Lorraine military law is required. In short, the only peaceful spot is Heligoland, and the crowning campaign which was to down Bolshevism under Winston Churchill looks like ending in disaster, for the parts of Russia which were to go in and win rebel now that they know that Denikin and the "Black" Czar, carefully preserved by the Council for the throne of Russia, have no intention of recognizing Esthonian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Polakian, Italo-Turkestan independence any more than we would recognize the independence of Surrey and the Carnarvon Boroughs. The "new" West Russian Republic is merely another sanitary cordon which neither Denikin nor Czar, nor any Russian general, will ever accept except in so far as their help may suit this or that man's immediate purposes. And so the welter goes on in cumulative chaos while ridiculous politicians shriek "Production." Production for whom, for what? The greater the European chaos, the more disturbed will the markets be—that is all. And the higher the prices, here and everywhere. The root of the high prices is European chaos, the fruit of the Paris Congress which thought politically or on the map. As the map is deranged, so the economics of the map are disturbed. America is finding it, too. To sell, she has to grant huge credits. On what? We have had to arrange for a £20,000,000 credit in order that we can sell. Soon it will be £50,000,000. It will be £100,000,000 shortly. And then we shall find more chaos and our "security" vanishing into the quantity of the Russian Loan.

People who talk of high prices should consider first causes. The cause is the map of Europe as arranged by the would-be Napoleons of Paris. They have reconstituted Europe on purely military lines, thus: first an Esthonian, Lithuanian, Lettish northern line (which Russia will never recognize); then the "sanitary cordon," to divide Germany from Russia, running from the Baltic to Fiume (which line is already fighting among itself and will Balkanize Europe until it is broken); lastly, on the Rhine, which we were to hold with vast forces for fifteen years (already this "joy" occupation is dwindling under the pressure of economy raised by the Northcliffe press, who see that "playing at soldiers" must involve the country in *de facto* bankruptcy).

But this is the cause of low output, high "rates," and bad markets—that is, high and rising prices, which at last are beginning to frighten finance or credit. Thus, instead of peace, Europe is in complete turmoil, is not producing, is on the verge of starvation, is utterly chaotic. We start tribunals: milk rises to 1s. a quart. Embargoes and Orders in Council do the rest, and so the consumer here pays. Now, remember, we have not attempted to face the debt yet. We have not even attempted to budget, for this year we fix up on more borrowing. We have not begun to call in the unfunded notes yet. And still the silly politicians shriek "Production." For whom? America wants little from us. France wants little. And we must import forty per cent. of our food. Suppose we super-produced, where should we sell at the high rates we would demand? Against Germany's low exchange! Glass—compare our prices with Belgium's. Europe wants food, not luxuries. The real need is controlled production based on coöperation. But this is only possible given political stability. The more Europe grows chaotic, the less will be Europe's purchasing power, for to sell on a new orgy of credit would be the last straw. Business men must surely realize this. Super-production at the present time would mean useless production, and the stuff would have to go to Slough or some of the many other depots where officialdom plays at control. The truth is, Europe cannot buy, having no credit. Therefore the rich part of Europe cannot hope to export much. Prices thus are furiously abnormal. All this is the work of Mr. Lloyd George at Paris, who bowed to M. Clemenceau instead of trying with Wilson to make a constructive peace. We shall now find economy all round is imperative. Mr. Churchill's armies will have to be demobilized. The Russian war will have to be chucked. All doles must cease. In a word, we shall have to cut down, including the production of all unnecessary things. If Europe goes on for another six months in chaos, then the crash will come, for the Soviet system will then prove the most economic.

The Atlantic Bridge

WE reprint below, from *The Daily News* (London) of October 11, portions of an article by Mr. A. G. Gardiner, discussing Anglo-American relations in the light of the Irish problem.

In view of a rather prolonged absence in America, I shall take this opportunity—the last I shall have of addressing the readers of *The Daily News* for some time—to glance at one or two subjects which affect this country and America in common. I shall do this because I think the most important question in the world today is the question of the relations of Great Britain and America. On the face of it, of course, there ought to be no doubt about those relations being satisfactory. . . .

In discussing this great matter, it is necessary to be perfectly candid. I rejoice in all the social exchanges and pleasant civilities between the two peoples, which we are witnessing in these days. But we shall deceive ourselves if we think that social civilities alone will lay the foundation that we seek. They are important, but they must not blind us to the realities. We shall not reach the goal of a lasting Anglo-American understanding without resistance. There are hostile influences in both countries. I do not think there is much definitely anti-American feeling in this country, but there is a great deal of ignorant misunderstanding, fed by the baser part of the Press, which in given circumstances would easily blaze into a definitely hostile feeling. In America there is undoubtedly a large element of active hostility to this country. It has its root in historic causes, and before we wax indignant about it we had better ask ourselves whether we were responsible for the causes, and, if so, what we have done to remove them.

Among these causes there is one of immediate and dominating anxiety. Ireland lies between us and America politically no less than geographically. If there is to be an Anglo-American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bridge across the Atlantic, Ireland must be its main support. There can be no bridge without the good will of Ireland. That is axiomatic, and so long as we refuse to recognize the fact our pleasant words and pious hopes are wasted. It is important to bear this in mind now, for at this moment, as the careful reader of the newspapers will observe, Ireland is again the central issue of this country and, in a very real sense, of the world. For if we cannot make peace with Ireland there can be no peace in the world. Like Russia, it is our "acid test."

The reason for the emergence of the question at this moment is simple. We are waiting for the peace treaty with Turkey. It is the last of the peace treaties, and the delay in producing it is not wholly due to the difficulties of the problem. It is due also to Ireland. On the day that the last of the peace treaties is accepted, the Home Rule Act passed in 1914, and now on the Statute Book, comes automatically into operation. No one wants it to come into operation. It would have settled the Irish question in 1914. It will not settle it today. In the meantime Sir Edward Carson, who has been the *de facto* ruler of Ireland throughout the war, has made it irrelevant. His revival of the policy of physical force has changed Ireland into a rebel country. John Redmond staked everything on bringing Ireland into the war . . .

He was beaten, and he died of a broken heart. Carsonism destroyed the constitutional movement, brought in the gun running and rebellion, and turned the Irish nation almost as one man to Sinn Fein. . . .

That is the position today. Ireland repudiates English government root and branch. Its elected representatives ignore Parliament; its people are held down by 60,000 British soldiers with tanks and all the equipment of war; it is an enemy country governed by the bayonet. And lest there should be a single moderate influence left in the land, a single fragment of respect for British rule, the incredible dunces who misgovern the country suppress newspapers like *The Cork Examiner* for publishing Sinn Fein advertisements appealing for funds. And meanwhile millions are being raised for the cause in America, and all the anti-British influences are being mobilized against an Anglo-American understanding.

Now we are to have a new settlement to put the Home Rule Act to sleep, and judging from the inspired forecasts it is to be another fraudulent device. There are, I gather, to be two Irelands and two Parliaments—a Dublin Parliament and a Belfast Parliament. That will not succeed, and no one thinks it will succeed, for Irishmen will die rather than see their country disrupted. It will be simply an artifice for suspending the Home Rule Act and going ahead with the military occupation. There is only one course that can succeed at this late hour. It is the concession of full Dominion government for the whole of Ireland, with an option to the Ulster counties to vote themselves out. At the most three Ulster counties . . . would vote themselves out, possibly only two, and in five years their interests would almost certainly bring them in.

Neither Carsonism nor Sinn Fein would accept this settlement, but reasonable opinion all over Ireland would rejoice in it, and both schools of extremists would wilt away under its operation. There would doubtless remain a core of rebel sentiment, but it would lose its force when its activities were directed against a Dublin Parliament instead of an alien Parliament. Nothing is, historically, more indisputable than that rebellion cannot live in a free, self-governing atmosphere. We have made rebellion in Ireland: we alone can unmake it.

And in unmaking it we shall not only win a profitable friend in place of an unprofitable enemy, relieve our finances of the intolerable burden of an army on what the engaging Mr. Churchill would call "the Irish front," make our talk about self-determination and freedom something better than an odious hypocrisy, and show that our support of the League of Nations was a reality; we should (and this is the point with which I am chiefly concerned at this moment) remove the gravest obstacle to good will between this country and America. We cannot be sure of that good will a day so long as Ireland lies like a powder magazine between us. Foolish people talk of the danger to us of a free Ireland in the event of trouble. One might as well talk of the danger of having a friend living next door instead of an enemy. And when we remember that the friendship of Ireland means the friendship of America—or at all events that without the one we can never be sure of the other—it will be seen that it is no extravagance to say that the reconciliation of Ireland is the key to the world's peace. . . .

THRIFT and CONSERVATION
HOW TO TEACH IT. By Arthur H. Chamberlain, Chairman, Thrift Education, N.E.A., and James F. Chamberlain.
This new volume in LIPPINCOTT'S SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL GUIDES, edited by W. F. Russell, A.B., Ph.D., Univ. of Iowa, sets forth the principles of teaching thrift, one of the big problems of reconstruction now in the hands of the teachers of this Nation. **Price $1.40.**
J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY - Philadelphia

THE LATEST BOOKS
By LAJPAT RAI:
THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF INDIA
By ARTHUR RANSOME:
RUSSIA IN 1919
Each $1.50 net; postpaid $1.60
PUBLISHED BY B. W. HUEBSCH NEW YORK

Harvard Studies in English, II
The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory
By W. ROY MACKENZIE
xv+278 pages $2.50
Valuable to students of mediaeval literature for its analysis of the religious drama and for its summaries of separate plays. *At all bookshops*
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
29 Randall Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
280 Madison Avenue, New York City

All Students of Current History
should have the following authoritative documents:
The League of Nations..... 15c.
A Practical Suggestion by Lieut-Gen. Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, P. C.
Decrees and Constitution of Soviet Russia ..... 25c.
Majority and Minority Reports of Coal Industry Commission of Great Britain ..... 25c.
Get these at your bookshop, or direct from
The Nation Press, Inc.
20 Vesey Street New York

Etudiants du Français Read LE MONDE FRANCIS. Fascinating 32-p. booklet, well illustrated, subjects of a general interest to students of the language. Letters from France, travel sketches, stories, jokes, vocabulary. Very simple, idiomatic French. 90c. for Nos. 1-5.
Estudiantes de Español Read EL PANORAMA. Similar series on life in Spanish-speaking world. Nos. 1-6, $1.10 postapid. For $2.00 French booklets (1-5). Spanish (1-6). A. G. MERRILL. Pub., 330 Webster Ave., Chicago.

CHIMNEY-POT PAPERS
Essays by CHARLES S. BROOKS
Author of
"Journeys to Bagdad" and "There's Pippins and Cheese to Come"
$2.00
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
120 College St., New Haven, Conn. 280 Madison Ave., N.Y.C.

AGAINST THE WINDS
By KATE JORDAN
"'AGAINST THE WINDS,' is an absorbing book . . . completely American, graphic, realistic, yet sympathetic, it reaches a high mark of fictional excellence . . . there is romance of an emphatic variety in the story . . . one of the best American novels of the season."—*Chicago Tribune.*
348 Pages $1.60 Net
LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, BOSTON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED